Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-124
Thursday
29 June 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-124 *29 June 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Decisive Stage' of Nuclear Test Ban Talks Opens *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 1
Bush 'Confrontational Outlook' on Arms Talks Noted *[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 1
U.S. Senators Briefed on Soviet Disarmament Policy *[TASS]* 3
U.S. Development of New Nuclear Weapons Reported *[TASS]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Says Nationalities Plenum Set for July *[TASS]* 5
Polyakov Assesses Paris CSCE Human Rights Forum *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

KGB's Kryuchkov Says Orlov Committed Suicide *[Moscow International]* 6
Career, 'Inner Conversion' of Orlov Described *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]* 6
PRAVDA Reports on Bush Interview by U.S. Paper *[28 Jun]* 7
Admiral Crowe Comments on Soviet Troops 17 Jun *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* 7
U.S. Blamed for Various Regional Conflicts *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 7

China

Text of Gorbachev's Message to Jiang Zemin *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 9
State of U.S.-PRC Relations, Business Ties Viewed *[TRUD 28 Jun]* 9
Army Reporter Gives Impressions of Beijing *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 10

Northeast Asia

TASS Political Analyst Reviews Cambodian Situation *[Biryukov]* 12
Search for Cambodian Solution in 'Final Stage' *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 13

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Cited on Talks With Morocco's Filali 14
Ready for Lebanon Peace *[Moscow International]* 14
'Unreservedly' Supports Arab League *[TASS]* 14
More on Visit by Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani 15
Noninterference Pledge Behind Arms Deal *[Kuwait AL-QABAS 26 Jun]* 15
Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Velayati on USSR Trip *[Moscow International]* 15
Trade Official on Cooperation *[Moscow International]* 16
Prospects for Trade Examined *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 23 Jun]* 16
Expansion of Business Ties Viewed *[TASS]* 17
More on Katushev 11-13 Jun Visit to Iraq *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 17
Sikh Separatist Actions Discussed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Jun]* 17

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Continues Visit to USSR 18
Talks With Gorbachev Reported *[East Berlin ADN]* 18
Leaders Make Speeches at Luncheon *[Moscow Radio]* 20
'Understanding' in Leaders Talk *[TASS]* 20
Gorbachev Receives Honecker *[PRAVDA 29 Jun]* 21
Honecker Arrives in Magnitogorsk *[East Berlin ADN]* 22
Attends Friendship Dinner in Magnitogorsk *[East Berlin ADN]* 22
Visits Magnitogorsk Iron-Steel Combine *[East Berlin ADN]* 23
Visits Kara-Dyr Viewing Platform *[East Berlin ADN]* 23

West Europe

Turkey's Yilmaz Cited on Soviet 'Goodwill' Gesture *[Ankara TV]* 23
PRAVDA Reports on Maksim Gorkiy Accident *[21 Jun]* 24
Maksim Gorkiy Heads for FRG Port for Repairs *[TASS]* 24
Correspondent Views European Election Outcome *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 25
Brutents Views Socialist International *[TASS]* 25

Latin America & Caribbean

Paraguayan Communist Party Figure Interviewed 26
Part 1 *[Moscow International]* 26
Part 2 *[Moscow International]* 27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA Reports 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings 29
Morning Session Reported *[28 Jun]* 29
End of 27 Jun Session *[28 Jun]* 32
More on 28 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings 34
Ryzhkov on Vacant Ecological Chair *[Moscow TV]* 34
Abalkin Endorsed as Deputy Chairman *[TASS]* 35
Belousov's Candidacy Discussed *[TASS]* 36
Belousov Addresses Session *[Moscow Radio]* 36
Lapygin on Defense Committee *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Government Leaders Grant Interviews to Media 38
Kryuchkov Interviewed on Security *[Moscow International]* 38
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Proceedings *[Moscow International]* 38
29 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 40
Government Post Debates Resume *[TASS]* 40
Biryukova Considered, Approved *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Candidacy Debate Length Limited *[TASS]* 41
Gusev Elected Deputy Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Debate on Defense Committee Analyzed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 41
Lapygin Explains Security Committee's Role *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 43
PRAVDA Readers' Reactions to Congress Reviewed *[20 Jun]* 45
'People's Power' Needed for Rule-of-Law State *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 47
CPSU Ideology Aide Speaks on Congress, Reforms *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 48
CPSU's Pugo Speaks on Congress, Party's Role *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 49
IZVESTIYA Discusses Congress Resolution *[27 Jun]* 50
Congress Deputies on Ryzhkov Speech, Yeltsin *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 24]* 52
Lukyanov Briefs Moscow Association on Congress *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 54

Further Reports on Situation in Fergana Oblast 56
Curfew 'Partially Lifted' *[Moscow International]* 56
Fergana Party Workers Assessed *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 56
Uzbek KGB Chief on Fergana Events *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 58
Continued Reportage on Novyy Uzen Disturbances 59
Ministry Official Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 59
Oil Output Increasing *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Moscow Paper Describes Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]* 60
Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council of Ministers *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Baklanov Visits Moscow Aircraft Equipment Factory *[TASS]* 62
Medvedev, Vlasov Attend Poet's Anniversary Meeting *[TASS]* 62
Brazauskas Proposes Lithuanian Party Independence *[Vilnius Radio]* 62
Lithuania's Brazauskas Interviewed on Sovereignty *[Vilnius Radio]* 64
Lithuanian Deputy Defends Economic Program
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 7 Jun] 66
Estonian Interethnic Relations Draft Published *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 66
TASS Reports on Draft Platform 67
Riga Gorkom Responds to People's Front Appeal *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 8 Jun]* 67
Two New Local Leningrad 'Front' Groups Emerge *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 69
Bessarabian Anniversary Marred by Protesters *[Moscow Radio]* 69
NKAO Sees Azerbaijan 'Interference' Continuing *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 7 Jun]* 70
Program Discusses Ukrainian National Identity *[Kiev International]* 71
Ukrainian Activists Help Radio Liberty *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 11 Jun]* 72
Rail Minister Interviewed on Bashkir Accident *[GUDOK 18 Jun]* 74
'Truth' About 1957 Nuclear Accident Revealed *[TRUD 21 Jun]* 74
1957 Disaster, Nuclear Plant Siting Linked *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Jun]* 75
Suffering From Chernobyl-Related Illness Continues *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 77
IAEA Approves Gorkiy Nuclear Plant Siting *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Jun]* ... 79
Zaykov, Scientists Discuss Nuclear Safety *[TASS]* 80
Sociologist on Implications of Restructuring
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 24 Jun] 81
Roy Medvedev Criticizes PRAVDA on Gdlyan-Ivanov *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 82
Donetsk Racketeers Get 'Severest Posible' Sentences *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 83
Holy Synod Panel Examines Repressions *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 84
RSFSR Writers View Ethnic Relations *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jun]* 84
Authorial Rights of Solzhenitsyn Violated *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 86
New Film 'The Slave' Reflects Reality *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 24]* 87

Military

Continued Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident 87
No Radiation Found at Accident Site *[TASS]* 87
Sub To Be Checked for Radiation *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Collision With Bird Cause of MiG Airshow Crash *[TASS]* 88

'Decisive Stage' of Nuclear Test Ban Talks Opens

LD2806140989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kosinskiy dispatch: "The Door to Agreement Is Open: Nuclear Test Ban Talks Enter Decisive Stage"]

[Text] Geneva—The fourth and latest round of full-scale Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation and cessation of nuclear tests opened in Geneva on Monday [27 June]. There is a positive international response to the resumption of this dialogue following a 6-month break, with the cessation of nuclear explosions at the two countries' test sites being directly dependent on its successful development.

In what way does the new round differ from its predecessors? One primarily notices optimism in the appraisal of the immediate prospects, an optimism which, moreover, stems from direct participants in the talks. Soviet delegation head I. Palenykh emphasizes that, in the 20 months separating the opening of the Geneva talks on the limitation and cessation of nuclear tests from the current round, the two sides have succeeded in achieving a considerable alignment of positions regarding the basic questions on the agenda, and in laying a sound foundation for the achievement of practical results at the present stage. His U.S. colleague Paul Robinson largely shares this optimism. It seems as if a favorable situation is being created for the achievement of specific results within the next 5-6 weeks of the current round.

The question of shortcomings in the monitoring mechanism of preceding agreements, which was actively raised by the U.S. side, was long the main stumbling block at previous stages of the talks. There has been success in partly removing the obstacle. The delegations were able to elaborate a new monitoring mechanism for the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes and right away proceeded to agree on the draft of a similar verification protocol to the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests reducing their ceiling to 150 kilotons. Due to the U.S. Senate's refusal to ratify these treaties on the pretext of difficulties in monitoring their application, they remained unratified and were only de facto observed by the USSR and the United States. Since the verification protocol to the 1976 treaty is already prepared, the main practical objective of the newly opened round is to prepare and adopt the next juridical document, namely, a protocol to the 1974 treaty. Both sides declare that they are ready for this and are close to reaching accord.

This alignment of positions became possible thanks to a lot of joint preparatory work. During the break between the previous and the current rounds the Soviet Union and the United States exchanged visits by specialists to their test sites for the purpose of working out monitoring measures and defining the degree of their efficiency. At present both delegations at the talks have at their disposal enough of the material required to complete this work.

Rapid achievement of agreement between the sides would make it possible to gain time and move on to the discussion of other important problems on the current round's agenda: The further limitation of the yield and number of nuclear tests along the path to their complete cessation. You automatically ask at this point: How much more time and how many more rounds will be necessary to draw nearer to this goal? The Soviet side's stance at the talks is perfectly clear. The USSR proposal on the immediate cessation of nuclear tests has been on the negotiating table ever since the first round.

One can also add that, since the summer of 1985 when the Soviet Union announced the unilateral introduction of a moratorium on its nuclear tests, which was extended twice and remained in force for a long period of 18 months, the proposal to resume it remains in force to this day. But there is just one condition this time, that the United States join the Soviet moratorium.

The achievement of agreement on ceasing nuclear tests depends not so much on the time taken by talks and the number of rounds but rather on the political will of the participants—primarily the United States. Especially since guaranteed success in limiting and banning nuclear tests could promote progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms being held in parallel in Geneva.

Bush 'Confrontational Outlook' on Arms Talks Noted

PM2706125189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer Aleksandr Golts under the rubric "The World Today—Problems and Opinions": "Talks Start in Geneva: But Where Are They Headed?"]

[Text] After a long break, due to the change of administration in Washington, the Soviet-American talks—those on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms—have resumed in Geneva. But the latest resumption in Geneva has attracted lively comment in the world press and the attention of many prominent politicians.

This is natural, after all. Behind the hundreds of figures and the unpronounceable abbrevations used by diplomats and experts lies the future of mankind. Many people today are wondering whether the representatives of the two great powers will succeed in achieving a reasonable compromise—a compromise that would lead to a 50-percent reduction in strategic weapons by both sides and would prevent the militarization of space.

Mankind's heightened attention was clearly manifested in the lines of a declaration by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania that has just been published in the press. Welcoming the political commitment by the USSR and the United States to reduce strategic nuclear armaments, they urge not only that the pace of progress toward disarmament not slacken but also that it be given greater impetus.

The USSR's position on this problem is perfectly clear, and it was reflected in M.S. Gorbachev's reply message. "The process of nuclear disamament which began with the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles must become irreversible," the Soviet leader stressed. "The next stage is the completion of Soviet-U.S. talks on a 50-percent reduction in their strategic offensive armaments under conditions of the preservation of the ABM Treaty. The foundation for this already exists, and the remaining unresolved issues are not, in our view, insuperable, as long as the proper efforts are made by both sides."

The 10 rounds that have taken place so far have provided substantial groundwork. Joint drafts have already been prepared for five important documents. On the main question, the treaty itself—which, it is reported, is now 90 percent ready—it has been agreed to establish ceilings of 1,600 strategic delivery vehicles and 6,000 units of weapons for them. Subceilings have also been established of 4,900 units for the total number of weapons for ICBM's and submarine-launched ballistic missiles [SLBM's] and 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles. Agreements have also been reached on the size of reductions of the total throw-weight of ICBM's and SLBM's.

But there are still many complex problems. The talks participants have to find a formula indicating the link between the reduction of nuclear armaments and guaranteed nonmilitarization of space. Solutions also have to be found for such questions as sea- and air-launched cruise missiles. Can solutions be found? Certainly. It is important to note that the USSR came to the talks willing to bring about the elimination of the two sides' concerns on any issue.

And what about the United States? Its approach is arousing a great deal of interest. Since the change of administration in Washington there has been a prolonged analysis of the global situation, including Soviet-U.S. relations. It follows from President Bush's statement that there has been practically no change in the U.S position on fundamental issues. But is that so?

The biggest surprise was the U.S. proposal to give priority to the achievement of an accord on verifying and monitoring one another's strategic armaments, and even the commencement of its implementation. Before the conclusion of a treaty, what is more. Thus, in the U.S. President's opinion, it is possible to monitor the potential for effective verification and inspections.

It must be said that this proposal brought a sharp reaction from a number of authoritative experts. "Monitoring is the last refuge of the desperados who want to wreck the conclusion of a treaty," P. Warnke, former head of the arms control agency, has said.

Anyway, verification issues have long since ceased to be irksome for our country. Implementing the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles convincingly demonstrated that. But in this case the question arises: What, in fact, are the Americans intending to verify? If treaty observance, what treaty? After all, there isn't one yet. And insisting on verification before an agreement has been drawn up is not just putting the cart before the horse. It is putting the cart at a point the horse simply has not yet reached.

The approach formulated by Bush bears the heavy imprint of a confrontational outlook. There is a constant attempt to combine things that are incompatible—reducing nuclear weapons and modernizing them. Yes, indeed. According to the administration, "the strategic programs form an interrelated whole that is intended to provide an effective deterrence policy and grant the means to promote treaties on strategic offensive armaments and keep the pressure on the Soviets."

Washington has no desire to abandon "strong-arm pressure" in relation to the Soviet Union. And the intention is to use the entire strategic triad to "pressure" our country. Every element of it is to be reequipped with improved means of destruction. The Trident-2 submarine fleet is to be reinforced. The Strategic Air Command is to receive B-2 bombers incorporating "Stealth" technology. The Pentagon believes that these combat aircraft are capable of effectively overcoming the adversary's ABM system. The story of the land-based ICBM's is very typical. It took the President several weeks to choose the best mobile ICBM option: either the plan for placing existing MX missiles on railroad flatcars in a crisis period or the proposal to create the new single-warhead Midgetman on a truck trailer. They are the two best, the President deciced, and asked Congress to fund both projects.

A few days ago he repeated his request, ordering the congressmen: "Do not pull the carpet out from under our feet." He meant that such a decision would make the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks more amenable. This is hardly likely. More to the point, there is a danger that could seriously undermine the talks. Indeed, the situation could easily arise where, at the time an agreement is signed, the United States will have such a perfect weapon that its potential would make up for all the proposed cuts.

Here, of course, one must mention the SDI program, which has been inhibiting the talks almost from the outset. Moreover, it should be noted that the interdependence of a future agreement and the ABM Treaty is by no means an artificial linkage invented by the Soviet representatives. The ABM Treaty, which limits the sides' ABM systems, is the foundation of strategic stability. Superiority in the protection of your own missile launch installations inevitably creates the illusion that you can get away with anything.

But SDI is precisely the program that can give rise to such illusions. In fact, the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment made a very remarkable statement: "SDI was conceived as an integral part of Washington's acquisition of a first-nuclear-strike potential." Unfortunately, Reagan's successor has also declared himself to be a devotee of SDI. The last time he stressed this was in connection with the Geneva talks.

It is true that little now remains of the ambitious plan to cover the entire territory of the United States with a reliable seven-tier space shield. Some projects have been unfeasible, others too expensive.

As a result, as far as one can judge from press reports, the implementation of the SDI program is following two courses at the moment. First, work to create the Alpha chemical laser, which was tested in April. Second, the version of SDI called Brilliant Pebbles. It involves placing tens of thousands of small interceptor-missiles in low, near-earth orbits. They would also be deployed on the ground, on launch vehicles. According to Monahan, director of the organization to implement SDI, the decision to start deployment could be taken in the next 3-4 years. And only the first 12 of them, Monahan believes, would fall within the ABM Treaty. "In the end," he stressed, "we will have to conduct tests that will require the cancellation or alteration of the treaty."

His chief, U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney, was even more resolute: "If we reach the level where we are capable of deploying SDI—I do not doubt that it will happen some day and that it will be incompatible with the ABM Treaty—I will advocate the renunciation of that treaty." Thus, U.S. strategists are willing to sacrifice any accords, even ones already reached, in the hope of achieving military superiority, including the formula which has already been found: "...elaborate an accord that would oblige the sides to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972... and not quit the ABM Treaty for an agreed period."

It is no accident, as CBS-TV notes in a commentary assessing the overall U.S. position at the talks in Gemeva, that "Bush is maybe the first U.S. President in many decades to make it known that the reduction of nuclear missiles is not his main priority. There are no new proposals and there is no new timeframe for the conclusion of a treaty." The television company sees it as the result of "distrust of the Soviets."

As soon as the President was elected he received, as is the tradition with the Republicans, an enormous volume of recommendations from the Heritage Foundation, a right-wing conservative think tank. They included the advice not to start talks on strategic offensive arms cuts before a year had elapsed. The President agreed to talks 6 months later. This seems to be typical of the U.S. position as a whole: middle-of-the-road, between the views of the Heritage Foundation and a realistic approach. So it is entirely a matter of the direction of movement. This will be apparent in the very near future.

U.S. Senators Briefed on Soviet Disarmament Policy

LD2806162689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1020 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Geneva, 28 Jun (TASS)—Meetings took place here between members of the Soviet delegation to the talks on nuclear space weapons and the group of U.S. senators headed by Claiborne Pell, chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This group arrived in Geneva to familiarize themselves with the progress in Soviet-U.S. talks which are being held here.

In light of the decision of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies on basic directions of internal and foreign policy of the USSR, the Soviet side elucidated the Soviet Union's principled attitude to questions of ensuring its security and to measures in the sphere of disarmament. Ideas were also expounded on the unsolved problems connected with working out the treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the U.S. while retaining and observing the ABM Treaty in the same shape as it was signed in 1972.

U.S. Development of New Nuclear Weapons Reported

LD2806092489 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 28 Jun 89

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Mostovets]

[Text] New York June 28 TASS— Despite the improvement in the world climate, the United States continues to develop new types of nuclear weapons. Far from reducing allocations for these purposes, the U.S. is increasing them, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR has revealed.

In the next fiscal year it is planned to allocate to the U.S. Department of Energy, which is in charge of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, 4.6 billion dollars—9.5 per cent up against the 1989 figure. At present the U.S. arsenal includes 27 types of nuclear weapons. They are continually being modernised, and new ones are being added.

Now the Pentagon is displaying a lively interest in the creation of a new powerful nuclear warhead for strategic missiles. A warhead of this type is capable of piercing a well reinforced silo and reaching a depth of 20 meters.

For the purpose of modernising its nuclear forces, the Pentagon is also developing a new type of warhead codenamed W-88. It is planned to fix them on Trident-2 missiles deployed on nuclear-powered submarines. Cruise missile warheads will also be modified.

Several new types of tactical nuclear missiles and aviation bombs, including for the Stealth strategic bomber, are also being developed. Three types of weapons, whose effect is based on nuclear explosions, are being developed in the Pentagon's laboratories and at test sites within the framework of the "Star Wars" programme.

Gerasimov Says Nationalities Plenum Set for July
LD2806185989 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee plenum on the nationalities issue is tentatively set for the end of July, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov announced at a news briefing today.

He said that all Supreme Soviet proceedings are taped and shown fully on television during the evenings and that the live coverage idea was dropped because "worker productivity in the country during the Congress of People's Deputies fell by some 20 per cent."

In any case, the current arrangement suits many Soviet people who cannot watch television during the day.

Gerasimov said that Moroccan minister of foreign affairs and cooperation Abdellatif Filali arrives in Moscow today as a representative of the trilateral committee on Lebanon, carrying a letter for Mikhail Gorbachev.

Polyakov Assesses Paris CSCE Human Rights Forum
LD2906084389 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 29 Jun 89

[By Yuvenaliy Polyakov, Soviet Foreign Ministry expert]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—The breakthrough towads creating common legal ground in Europe has been one important result of a recent Paris conference on the "human dimension" of the Helsinki process.

It was the first time that a Soviet initiative for unified standards on a package of humanitarian rights drew a positive response from Western partners and was officially suggested as a joint Soviet-French proposal. West Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia announced their decision to join it as well.

All in all, 36 new proposals on various humanitarian-legal matters were made, including 17 by socialist nations. All of them will be turned over for study to the governments of attending countries and to follow-up conferences. The first of these will take place in Copenhagen next year and the final one in Moscow in the autumn of 1991.

Despite the businesslike and useful exchange of opinions in Paris, there still are a number of problems in the humanitarian-legal sphere. Among other things, this is due to some Western delegations using a mentor's tone when speaking of human rights in socialist countries.

The Paris conference became the first forum to be held in accordance with standards for pan-European events, which were hammered out in Vienna. It was attended by representatives of international and national human rights organisations, including former Soviet nationals.

The arrival in Paris of a number of members of Soviet informal groups and so-called refuseniks and the Soviet delegation's openness to dialogue with all human rights campaigners was positively received at the conference.

In the Soviet Union it is believed that the Paris forum did much to consolidate transition from dialogue on all aspects of humanitarian problems to interaction among all states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

United States & Canada

KGB's Kryuchkov Says Orlov Committed Suicide

LD2806153989 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] The chairman of the USSR's State Security Committee, Vladimir Kryuchkov, has told a Radio Moscow reporter that the 32-year-old Soviet intelligence officer Mikhail Orlov, alias Souther, Glenn Michael, committed suicide.

In the letters he left, he thanked the Soviet Government for helping him to become a personality. Mikhail Orlov had the rank of a major. He has a wife who's Russian, and an 18 month old child. Glenn Michael has been buried in Moscow. The funeral was attended by his parents. Glenn Michael was born in Indiana in the United States. He acquired Soviet citizenship several years ago.

Mikhail Orlov was the name he chose himself. The notes he left are evidence of his great love for the Soviet Union and its people. Mikhail Orlov did a lot of travelling in this country. The State Security Committee chief says his death is a major loss. He was a very gifted person, considerate (? and touchy).

He said the reasons for the suicide were purely personal.

Career, 'Inner Conversion' of Orlov Described

PM2806194889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[R. Ignatyev article under the rubric "At the USSR KGB": "Intelligence Officer Who Worked Against War"]

[Text] The funeral of KGB Major Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov, a Soviet intelligence officer, took place in Moscow's Novokuntsevskoye Cemetery on 27 June.

His life was cut short at the age of 32.

As the obituary published in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 27 June states, M.Ye. Orlov lived a short but colorful and full life, devoting it entirely to the struggle to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind.

We wanted to learn more about this man, and the editorial office turned to his colleagues at the USSR KGB. This is what they told us.

Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov's real name is Glenn Michael Souther. He was born in 1957 in Hammond City, Indiana (United States). After school he entered a university but dropped out. He did not want to live a life of ease and decided to take an independent path.

On training as a naval photographer, Souther joined the Navy. There he realized the real danger of the nuclear threat—which prompted him to combat it within the ranks of Soviet intelligence. He was assigned to the U.S. 6th Fleet's nuclear-powered aircraft carrier "Nimitz." He also served on other ships based in the Mediterranean.

Then Glenn entered "Old Dominion" University in Norfolk city, remaining in service as a reservist. At a major U.S. Naval base he was engaged in processing space intelligence materials. It was during that period that he experienced an inner conversion [vnutrennyaya lomka]. Possessing particularly secret information, he became profoundly aware of the nuclear threat hanging over mankind. By that time Glenn was intensively studying the Russian language, was becoming keen on V. Mayakovskiy's poetry, and was interested in life in our country. He recited Mayakovskiy's verses at a competition for readers and prepared papers on the poet. Mayakovskiy became the human ideal for the American. And, in general, he saw the USSR as the country that was closer to him in terms of spirit and convictions. Glenn Souther finally realized the correctness of his decision.

Glenn Michael cooperated with Soviet intelligence for a long time. In the summer of 1986 he was summoned to the local FBI branch and asked where he had gotten his interest in the Soviet Union, why he was keen on Mayakovskiy, Shostakovich.... They demanded that Glenn not travel anywhere and made him take a "lie detector" test. He realized that it was not safe to remain in the United States any longer. Soon he found himself in Moscow....

Glenn Souther's mother and father remained in the motherland, and he was tried in absentia. Long articles about that trial appeared in newspapers in a number of countries.

In 1988 G. Souther asked the USSR Government to grant him political asylum, and he got it. From that moment he became Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov. He chose the name himself.

At his request he was taken on as a Soviet intelligence cadre, became an officer of the USSR KGB, and fulfilled responsible missions. It is to Mikhail Orlov's credit that a thaw has now become apparent in the world and that talks are being held on reducing nuclear and conventional arms. He lived for his ideals, was a strong, determined person, and worked to the limit of his ability.

He was buried according to all the rules of military ceremonial. His mother and father came to take their leave of him. In Moscow Mikhail Orlov has left behind his wife and 1-year-old daughter. Mikhail's friends and the KGB are taking care of them.

M.Ye. Orlov was recently awarded the Order of the Friendship of the People, but he did not have time to receive it....

PRAVDA Reports on Bush Interview by U.S. Paper

PM2806112389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "G. Bush Interview"]

[Text] New York, 27 Jun—"I believe that on the whole our relations with the Soviets are progressing, albeit cautiously, in the right direction," U.S. President G. Bush declared in an interview with THE NEW YORK TIMES published today. In his opinion, the administration he heads "can have productive relations" with the Soviet leadership.

"I do not think it seems to them that I want to turn the clock back or that our foreign policy is designed to some extent to drag its feet or to put them in a difficult position in connection with certain initiatives advanced by them," the President said. At the same time Bush essentially confirmed the U.S. press reports which had appeared earlier that Washington is still not proposing new approaches at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons.

The President was asked whether he considers it possible to accelerate the course of the talks by taking any steps with regard to the problems connected with "Star Wars" and sea-launched cruise missiles. Bush declared in reply that, from his viewpoint, "to move the talks on limiting strategic offensive arms forward the United States is not obliged to waive its opinion regarding the 'Strategic Defense Initiative.'"

A number of other international problems were also touched on during the interview. In particular, the President pointed out that he deems it inexpedient at the present moment for the United States to take any steps toward improving relations with Iran.

Admiral Crowe Comments on Soviet Troops 17 Jun

PM2306155389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent Colonel A. Smolyanko report: "Stay in Belorussia"]

[Text] On 17 June Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and those accompanying him arrived in Minsk. He was met at the airport by Colonel General A. Kostenko, commander of the Belorussian Military District; Lieutenant General N. Boyko, member of the Military Council and chief of the district political directorate; and Soviet Armed Forces generals and officers.

On the way up the Burial Mound of Glory Admiral W. Crowe stopped and laid flowers at the Soviet soldiers' monument.

At a training center the U.S. delegation observed the progress of a motorized rifle battalion's tactical exercises. Under the command of Guards Major E. Apoyan the soldiers demonstrated high firing skills. Then Admiral W. Crowe was acquainted with the Ground Forces' latest combat equipment and arms. A crew under the command of Senior Lieutenant A. Chernyshev demonstrated its work skills with guns. The U.S. guest talked with the soldiers and handed them souvenirs.

W. Crowe shared his impressions about what he had seen with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent:

"We attended real exercises. I very much liked the way your soldiers fulfill their tasks. It was clear that they are disciplined. They have a highly patriotic spirit. It was a great honor that we were shown everything and that we were able to look at and assess everything."

In the afternoon Admiral W. Crowe visited the Belorussian State Museum of the History of the Great Patriotic War.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev accompanied the guest.

U.S. Blamed for Various Regional Conflicts

18070318 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Yuriy Glukhov under the rubric "View From Moscow": "Do Not Allow a Movement Backward"]

[Text] Will it be possible to put out the flame of regional conflicts? Will the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan become a turning point in that country's life and an example of breaking up dangerous situations? Will it also be possible to develop another success like that achieved in defusing the situation in South Africa? Or is movement backwards inevitable? How long will the Arab-Israeli confrontation last? Will the armistice in the Persian Gulf be only a temporary lull? Why, along with breakthroughs in the main directions of international detente, are there frequently failures in peripheral sectors?

These are not idle questions. The situation in "hot spots" in many ways determines the general political climate of the planet. This is the reason why it is not possible to pass over in silence alarming trends that let themselves be felt in the development of regional conflicts.

In violation of the Geneva agreements, for example, the United States accelerated the delivery of weapons to the Afghan opposition. Simultaneously, as the visit to Washington by Pakistan Prime Minister B. Bhutto showed, Pakistan's military clique, which is "supporting" the Afghan mujahidin, is beginning to exercise its muscles. In particular, a new batch of 60 F-16 aircraft is being delivered to Pakistan. The United States has buried its own proposal concerning a "negative symmetry"—the cessation of weapons supplies by parties to the Afghan conflict.

We see the same situation in an African version. Despite the significant progress in the matter of a peaceful settlement of the situation in Southwest Africa [Namibia], writes the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES, the Bush administration is attempting to increase substantially secret military assistance to the insurgent UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] organization in Angola. The newspaper calls on Congress to show opposition to this.

The administration, continues THE NEW YORK TIMES, asserts that the strengthening of UNITA will promote the process of "national reconciliation." In fact, the additional military assistance will only delay the recently initiated movement in the direction of compromise in Angola, where a civil war is going on. Moreover, an expansion of military assistance will raise doubts about the sincerity of the efforts of the administration towards cooperation with Moscow in the settlement of regional conflicts.

The example cited above is far from the last stroke of the brush in the picture of aggravating the military situation in individual regions. Unfortunately, such actions are not the exception.

Real prospects for settlement in Kampuchea [Cambodia] were barely contemplated when the Bush administration made a decision to provide military assistance to the "non-communist resistance forces" in that country. Prince Sihanouk refuses to have anything to do with this assistance. The American Congress has not shown any readiness to vote for it. "Nonetheless, the administration, apparently, intends to furnish this assistance secretly, and with a resoluteness that deserves better application," THE NEW YORK TIMES indicates

Continuing the theme, I will recall the support for the Nicaraguan contras, and the all-around assistance to the Israeli aggressors, who annually receive a gratuity of $3 billion. And this is by no means a full list.

The negative consequences of this kind of policy by the United States are evident. Attempts to block the search for reconciliation in Afghanistan have been intensified. In the Near East, Tel Aviv has sabotaged a political settlement for decades. It has already been a year and a half since the Israeli militarists began suppressing the intifadah—the uprising of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. During the time of the reprisals against the recalcitrants, more than 500 persons have been killed, thousands have been injured, and tens of thousands have been in prisons and camps, but Washington did not censure these outrages with one word.

A double morality and a double standard are but another attribute of the past in the American approach to regional conflicts. This duality is contained in the stubborn unwillingness to recognize objective reality, for example, the Afghan government of Najibullah. The matter becomes absurd, inasmuch as it was precisely with this government that the Geneva agreements were concluded and affixed with the signature of the U.S. Secretary of State.

We observe the very same focus in the "non-recognition" of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its leader 'Arafat, and the rights of the Palestinians to create their own state. Even though the PLO is recognized by the world community as the only legal representative of the Palestinian people, and the right of the Palestinians to a state is stipulated in UN decisions, just as is the right of Israel.

A rejection of the rights of others gives rise to a false picture of a permissiveness that borders on adventuristic actions. The United States even assumes the role of an observer of world order. Grenada found itself under the heel of American Marines. Lebanon became a victim of aggression, where the United States virtually came to the aid of the Israeli occupiers. The patrolling of the Pentagon's naval armada in Persian Gulf waters was concluded with an act of bloodshed. It has to its credit not only the destruction of Iranian oil drilling platforms and cutters, but also the downining of a passenger aircraft. Libya was subjected to military blackmail three times for short periods. The matter came to an air attack on that country by the U.S. Air Force with the involvement of NATO. In particular, bases were used that are deployed on the territory of Great Britain, and the "Libyan dossier" is not closed. A rather recent incident occurred this year in which American pilots shot down two Libyan fighters.

There is a special danger in the cowboy syndrome to "go for the gun," which works every time the development of events for some reason does not stay within a framework designed by Washington, or when it does not correspond with its concept. The result even of the elections in Panama, for example, becomes a reason for a massive airlift of American troops to the Panama Canal Zone. The situation is actually being artificially incited with unpredictable consequences. In turn, the unwillingness to face reality inevitably results in miscalculations.

The American press has recently been openly discussing errors in estimates of the situation in Afghanistan. Contrary to the predictions of Washington strategists, the central Afghan government did not fall, and the policy of national reconciliation which it is conducting is acquiring more and more supporters. As a matter of fact, there is no other reasonable alternative. The reliance of Washington on the assorted forces of the opposition and activity which simply boils down to sabotage of a political settlement, is now subject to doubt. Voices are heard more and more frequently that censure the policy of interference in the affairs of Afghanistan.

Attempts to ignore the realities are boomeranging. The United States prohibited the entry into the country of PLO leader Ya. 'Arafat, who was to take part in a meeting of the UN General Assembly on the Palestine question. In response, official Washington received a

diplomatic slap in the face, when the UN arranged for an offsite meeting in Geneva. In the end, the American diplomats had to start an official dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

What a scandal the "North affair" turned out to be, with its secret deliveries of weapons to Iran and its support of the Nicaraguan contras, and the matter concerning the deception of the American Congress and illegal acts!

The non-observance of attained agreements, the sabotage of dialogue, the reliance on force, behind-the-scenes intrigues, and subversive activity—this is yesterday's approach to regional problems. It would be a mistake to present them as an arena for political recoupment. The Geneva agreements and the settlement of problems in Southwest Africa mark a new stage in cooperation in the resolution of regional conflicts. What has been achieved requires reinforcement and development. The world is indivisible. Each success or failure in any part is a victory or a defeat for the common cause of peace and security.

China

Text of Gorbachev's Message to Jiang Zemin

PM2806111989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[M.S. Gorbachev congratulations message to Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee]

[Text] To Comrade Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee:

Esteemed Comrade Jiang Zemin!
On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and from myself personally I congratulate you on your election as general secretary of the CPC Central Committee.

Expressing our good wishes to you, Communists, and all the Chinese people, I am confident that Soviet-Chinese relations will develop in a spirit of friendship and good-neighborly cooperation for the good of both countries and in the interests of peace throughout the world.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

State of U.S.-PRC Relations, Business Ties Viewed

PM2806130489 Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Jun 89 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Sukhotin report: " 'It Took Us Too Long To Get Here...': Chinese-American Relations Today"]

[Text] Beijing, Jun—"The chef has left for Singapore, but he promised to come back. We resumed work on 12 June—a week after what happened here. As you can see, there are just as many customers," the pretty Chinese girl working at "The Colonel's" whispered softly.

The spacious (1 million customers a year) American "Kentucky Fried Chicken" restaurant in Beijing was named after the firm's founder—Colonel Sanders. It is mainly Chinese citizens who come here. Thanks to them, the enterprise is flourishing. It is only 100 meters from Tiananmen Square, and from the restaurant windows you can see the House of Memory of Mao Zedong.

It is hard to give a simple assessment of the American presence in China. Incidentally, this summer the majority of members of the American colony in China left the country.

The United States reacted fairly abruptly to the tragic denouement of the "Beijing spring." In the initial emotional reactions, what happened was described as the failure of the reforms and the collapse of the policy of openness and the process of democratization of Chinese society. There also was a threat to cut military deliveries to China and impose other economic and political sanctions.

Furthermore, a number of Chinese diplomats left their missions in the United States and refused to return to China after the events of June. Chinese astrophysicist Fang Lizhi and his wife Li Shuxian took refuge on the territory of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. They are accused of "counterrevolutionary propaganda and incitement during the recent disorders and in the period preceding them," and are subject to immediate arrest, the order for which was given by the local authorities.

In response to these actions by the U.S. Embassy, the Chinese side expelled two permanently accredited American correspondents from the PRC.

Among the 15 or so orders from the authorities relating to the state of martial law in Beijing, a recent interview by an American television company correspondent with a PRC Government spokesman is also pinned up in the streets, setting forth in detail China's position on these problems. Active polemics are being conducted in the press in the two countries, too.

Incidentally, the fact that it was a U.S. journalist who was granted the exclusive right to such a conversation with the speaker of the PRC State Council after the June events is regarded here as a transparent gesture of increased attention by the PRC leadership to relations with its partner across the ocean. There is a kind of logic in this. New ills can stimulate old ones. And there are plenty of those, in general. There are comparatively trivial ones, like those of the American "Fried Chicken" shareholders, who, it is claimed, despite the flourishing business, do not know what to do with the mountains of yuan they have earned. It is well known that inconvertible money is worth less than ordinary paper abroad.

There are also more complex problems—from Taiwan and Tibet to the "computer wars" and arguments about how many children Chinese women can have. Moreover, Beijing and Washington, in improving their relations

with Moscow, clearly face the need to make adjustments to the relationship between them, too, and to some extent to revise their former approach to one another. But the Chinese side would, of course, not wish this to be at the cost of a reduction in the American presence in the PRC, whose jubilee—the 10th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations—was marked only 6 months ago, in mid-December. In the financial plane this presence takes the form of $3 billion in capital investments, one-tenth of which is direct investment, as well as $13.5 billion in bilateral trade. For comparison: The volume of China's trade with the USSR is a whole order of magnitude lower than this.

In business circles in the West and in other countries the opinion is expressed that the withdrawal of American capital from China could hardly be compensated for by an attempt by the PRC to diversify economic links with other partners, which are not ready to transfer leading technologies comparable with American ones.

The Chinese side does not want this, having declared at various levels that the policy of reforms and expansion of ties with the outside world, pursued over the past 10 years, remains unchanged.

It cannot be said that this appeal has gone unheeded. "It is not a question of profit, which has never been high in China," one Western businessmen, who asked to remain anonymous, said. "It took us too long and too much effort to get here to lose it all overnight. A total evacuation would rob us of the fruits of this work and the last remaining hope that everything will work out here."

Be that as it may, according to Chinese press reports none of the 2,800 foreign business missions in the PRC has yet announced its final liquidation.

But the American presence in China is not only dollars and technology. It carries a substantial cultural charge, too. The most impressive aspects of this are student exchanges and the influence of the Western way of life on an audience of billions via television.

Some 40,000 Chinese students are studying in the United States. On their return home they see many things through different eyes.

As for television, on which the programs are packed with information about the "free world," despite the consumerist tone that sometimes dominates, there is no denying that the programs have opened up to the Chinese a new and formerly unheard-of world of values.

At the same time the influence in the other direction must be noted. Intensive cultural exchange allows the inhabitants of distant continents to study the achievements of Chinese traditional culture, as well as moviemaking, painting, and literature.

Undoubtedly the links already established between China and the United States and other partners have great momentum of their own and create favorable conditions for finding a way out of the conflict situation. It is hard to say as yet what form this will take. But, as a middle-aged Beijing inhabitant, who described himself as a regular customer at "The Colonel's," observed, he would be very upset to lose the pleasure of eating Beijing chicken Kentucky-style at least once a month.

Army Reporter Gives Impressions of Beijing

PM2806110089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Captain 1st Class V. Kuzar report under the rubric "From a Travel Notebook": "The PRC: At a Turning Point"]

[Text] Beijing, Moscow—The first landing party of Soviet journalists arrived in Beijing a few days early to cover M.S. Gorbachev's visit. This time was naturally devoted to getting to know the Chinese capital. This wonderful city lured us into its streets, squares, and old quarters with its unfamiliarity and uniqueness. Even the names of its sights are wonderful: "Avenue of Heavenly Peace," "Gate of Great Harmony," "Scenic Hill," "Pavilion of Endless Contemplation"!... And their beauty is beyond words—they are magnificent.

Beijing wakes up early. And from the very first minutes, music plays in the parks and public gardens. To the music, office workers, housewives, and students begin their day with exercises in rhythmic gymnastics. Many people of the older generation practice the ancient Chinese art of Tai Chi Chuan. And some people do all this when they are already at work, because work will not wait—you have to deliver the morning newspapers, supply goods, and food products to the stores and cafes, and prepare the trolleybuses and buses to go out.

The streets gradually fill with Beijing inhabitants and their guests. And soon an endless human river is flowing along the sidewalks. The older people prefer to wear the traditional blue or gray clothing of cadre workers, while the young people follow, and sometimes preempt, modern fashion. The majority of the Beijing inhabitants are on bicycles, which still rule the streets for the time being. But they are gradually pushed to the edge of the pavement by mighty trucks and cars.

Then the lifting cranes begin their majestic movement, the pneumatic drills begin their clatter, the stores fling open their enticing doors... Beijing takes up its working pace, which will continue until late in the evening. But even after that, the noise will continue at the night bazaars, where those who worked by day at enterprises and state institutions now trade. The Chinese have a markedly passionate desire to escape from need and achieve a comfortable life. And this is supported in every way by the party and government.

A great experiment has been in progress in China for more than 10 years. Its essence is the socialist modernization of the country. The main aim of the current transformations is to create by the end of this century a developing society with average wealth. Some success has already been achieved on this path. The economy has been revived. Some of its spheres have surged resolutely forward in a short time. Thus the grain harvest has increased by 100 million tonnes, while the volume of industrial production is increasing by nearly 11 percent annually.

And what do the stores—a kind of barometer of the economic situation in the country—tell us about the reforms? Here is a street packed with little stalls and department stores, stands, and restaurants. This is Wangfujing, the city's old trading street. Here you can buy goods for any taste—vases and refrigerators, sandalwood fans and tape recorders, food products and television sets, air conditioners and... The majority of the goods are Chinese-made, but in quality they are up to the most exacting world standards. And they are still quite accessible to the consumer in terms of price. With an average wage of about 200 yuan, jeans cost about 27 yuan, for instance, shoes 30 or more, and a twin cassette player—300 yuan or more.

All that seems well enough. In any event, formerly my colleagues, describing the state of affairs in China, drew the line there and concluded that the economic reform is proceeding successfully. It was not customary to write about its shortcomings, although the Chinese themselves did not like the rosy colors in our reportage on the PRC, especially since complex problems were gradually accumulating in the country. The events of recent times, like a kind of turning point, highlighted the essence of these problems.

Today the "overheating" of the Chinese economy has been officially declared; it is not capable of effectively talking the full range of economic and social tasks at once. Capital construction has increased excessively and there is an ever increasing gulf in the development of different regions of the country. Inflationary trends are emerging and, most dangerously, a stratification of society is taking place—some people are becoming excessively rich, while others still eke out a semi-impoverished existence. Added to all this are the flourishing corruption and abuse of power, nepotism and favoritism. Some cadre workers have become involved in private business and already have profitable firms and stores. Crime has assumed a large scale.

In late April and early May there were student demonstrations in Beijing. The participants demanded the deepening of democracy, the acceleration of the processes of economic reform, and a resolute struggle against corruption. The demonstrators showed that there is growing dissatisfaction in the country both over the weaknesses in the implementation of economic reform and over the slow development of the democratization of political life. Thanks to the measures adopted and, first and foremost, dialogue with the students, at that time the wave of demonstrations was quelled. But, as it turned out, not for long.

On the 3d day of my stay in Beijing, on emerging from the hotel, I saw a student demonstration... on bicycles. Examining it with a good deal of curiosity, I could not imagine how it would all end. Like my journalist colleagues, with whom I exchanged impressions in the evening, the PRC leadership also, I think, did not predict such a drastic turn of events.

The student demonstration immediately began to snowball. In the afternoon of 13 May several thousand students declared a hunger strike in Tiananmen Square. This whipped up the atmosphere in Beijing to the limit. The capital's students were joined by students from other cities. On 17 May workers and employees of state institutions and members of the intelligentsia could be seen among the demonstrators. Foreign Ministry workers and party officials, servicemen and journalists, peasants and schoolchildren, and the staff of even such prestigious establishments as our hotel marched under red banners, singing the "International." Similar demonstrations gripped several other cities, too.

In the view of many observers, the Chinese authorities could have avoided confrontation. But they lost the opportunity. As yet, it is hard to say why. One thing is, however, clear: Certain people exploited the lack of readiness on the part of the country's leaders to say the necessary words to the students. These people, it was declared, were working toward political destabilization in the country, toward "provoking and organizing a counterrevolutionary rebellion in the capital." It is now becoming clear that external forces were also involved in this. Steps of some kind had to be adopted, and on 20 May martial law was imposed in Beijing. But that proved insufficient. And then the troops were given their orders...

But I was no longer a witness, because my mission to Beijing ended on 19 May. Of course, from Moscow I followed the development of events in the PRC and how units of the Chinese People's Liberation Army were brought in to liberate Tiananmen Square. The Chinese leaders' high assessment of the troops' actions is also well known. "Endangering their own lives," Deng Xiaoping stated, for instance, "the soldiers and officers of our Army did not forget the people, the party's teaching, and the interests of the state. Our Army is rightly called the people's Army, the defender of the state, the socialist system, and the people's interests."

It must be said that during my stay in Beijing I noted on several occasions that the Army enjoys prestige and respect among the Chinese people. While the student demonstrations were in progress I saw on several occasions demonstrators welcoming servicemen and bringing them water and icecream, even when the troop subunits were barring the students' way to some site or other. I

very much wanted to form a closer acquaintance with the Chinese Army's life. However, all my efforts to make contact with servicemen or even to visit the editorial offices of ZEFANGJUN BAO, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's sister newspaper, came to nothing. I had to be satisfied—admittedly not without benefit to myself—with a visit to the Museum of Revolution, which portrays the history of the Chinese Army since ancient times. In the museum I met a remarkable person.

"I very much regret that we cannot wear military uniforms. My post is equivalent to the rank of colonel." After a short mutual introduction, that is how Chou Cuixiang, an employee of the museum's propaganda department, began her story. She has served in the Chinese People's Liberation Army for more than 26 years. She began her career as a guide in this museum. In the years of the "Cultural Revolution" she was attached to a group of conservators. Among others, she defended the museum's leadership against repressions, because she knew that it was not engaged in counterrevolutionary activity. In general she does not like to recall this period, since she feels that her best years were wasted. After the "Cultural Revolution" she was appointed political instructor. She gradually climbed the ladder of offices and is now responsible for the museum's foreign ties.

Chou Cuixiang comes from a cadre party worker's family. Her father was repressed. He was sent to the "7 May School." He survived and came back to the family, and therefore, in Chinese terms, she is considered fortunate. The parents have seven children, six of whom are in the Army. As for Chou, she is married, with a 17-year-old son. Her husband is a military physician. He does not wear a uniform either. This dates from last year, when military ranks were introduced in the Chinese People's Liberation Army. At the same time the status of Chinese People's Liberation Army employees was introduced for certain categories—lawyers, medics, journalists, museum workers, and others. They retain all the privileges and benefits of servicemen, except the right to wear a military uniform.

Chou likes her work in the museum. A fine, harmonious collective of about 600 people has developed. There is much work. The exhibits occupy an area of 60,000 square meters. Every year some 2 million people visit the museum which is roughly between 2,000 and 10,000 people a day. Apart from accompanying tours, the museum staffers deliver special lectures on history for students of military educational establishments, organize mobile exhibitions, regularly hold scientific and historical seminars, and publish reference materials.

Why does the museum not have a section devoted to the Chinese Army today? It is hard to say. There was one before the "Cultural Revolution." It was entitled "Watching Over Socialism." It no longer exists. They say that a competition has been announced for the best project for an exhibition on this topic. But for the time being, there are temporary exhibitions.

The funds for maintaining the museum are appropriated by the Chinese People's Liberation Army Main Political Directorate. But they are insufficient, especially in view of the fact that a process of reducing military expenditure is currently under way. The Army has been obliged to earn funds for its own maintenance. The museum is doing the same. How does it work? In various ways. For instance, the museum has a hotel—anyone can stay there, not only servicemen, as was formerly the case. Rooms are leased out for various exhibitions. At the moment there is an exhibition of furniture in one of the museum's rooms, and recently there was an exhibition and sale of clothing. The rental is 2.5-3 yuan per square meter. Along with the Main Political Directorate, they participate in maintaining a poultry unit and a fish farm. The resources earned are used not only for the maintenance of the museum, but also for additional payments to personnel. In kind, it is true—in meat, eggs, and fish. But that is good, too, because prices are rising.

During our conversation Chou Cuixiang constantly stressed the need for the full restoration of Soviet-Chinese relations. "Our friendship has deep roots. Since childhood I have retained the image of the Soviet Union as a good friend of the Chinese people," she said. "Gorbachev's visit confirms this. We should have more contact with each other. In particular, the military museums of our two countries should have close links. This could only bring our peoples closer together and enrich us all." Chou's opinion is shared by everyone I met and talked with in the Chinese capital. They included elderly people and members of the young generation. And we cannot but find this gratifying.

That is what Beijing was like in May. The past month has brought sad news from the PRC. But let us be optimists. History testifies that worse difficulties than this are not beyond the powers of the Chinese people. So we wish them success in rapidly overcoming their internal differences and implementing the planned reforms. A great people is worthy of great changes.

Northeast Asia

TASS Political Analyst Reviews Cambodian Situation

LD2406004889 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS—By TASS political analyst Askold Biryukov.

Addressing a news conference in Bangkok, a representative of the Thai supreme military command resolutely advocated an end to any military aid to the warring Kampuchean groups, since this aid interferes with a peaceful settlement of the Kampuchean conflict. He pointed out that Thailand did not support U.S. efforts aimed at boosting aid to the two opposing groups, since this does not promote general trends in the region.

The Thai stand conforms to the course proclaimed recently by the country's Prime Minister Chatichai Chunhawan. He said that Indochina should not be a battlefield in the future but a place for developing trade and cooperation in the interests of nations living in this region.

This stand should be welcomed, since it reflects sentiments of all who are interested in the earliest peaceful political settlement of a regional conflict which mars the overall international situation. It is even more valuable due to the fact that it was proclaimed by a country which stood out repeatedly together with Washington and is considered one of its allies in the region.

It is long overdue for Washington too to make conclusions from the situation which is shaping up around a settlement of the Kampuchean conflict. Two informal meetings in Jakarta whose decisions provided for stopping foreign military aid and interference, a meeting between Kampuchean Prime Minister Hun Sen and the leader of the Kampuchean opposition, Prince Sihanouk, clearly indicated, it would seem, the course of actions for all interested parties. Next moves for settling the protracted conflict are also seen: a meeting of the Kampuchean sides in Paris, then an international conference, a withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea and, last but not least, general elections to new organs of state authority.

However, Washington does not notice all this, as it were. The White House does not hear even voices of U.S. legislators warning the administration against arms supplies to opposing Kampuchean groups, since this will help delay and kindle the conflict. The U.S. press reports that the administration tied by President Bush's directive (signed late last month) which authorizes the implementation of a secret programme for giving military aid to Kampuchean groups, now is engaged in a search for ways of demonstrating its support for insurgent forces.

In a word, the Washington scenario for settling the Kampuchean conflict stakes as before, not on political means but on armed struggle. This was confirmed by U.S. vice president Quayle who delivered a speech at the notorious Heritage Foundation where he called on the West to act and to give assistance to "non-communist forces" in Kampuchea.

But the West as well as the East understands the situation shaping up around Kampuchea more realistically than Washington. This is confirmed by the negotiations between the French and Vietnamese foreign ministers in Paris. Roland Dumas who had talks recently with the leaders of India, Indonesia, Thailand and Australia, told journalists after the end of the neotiations that France and Vietnam are convinced that an international conference on Kampuchea to be held in Paris early in August should ensure the final and overall settlement of this conflict.

It is high time for Washington too to heed the voice of wisdom raised both in the East and the West.

Search for Cambodian Solution in 'Final Stage'
BK2706105989 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 26 Jun 89

[Station observer Viktor Valentinov commentary]

[Text] The search for a solution to the Cambodian problem has entered its final stage. A clear formula to end the conflict has been reached and agreed upon. That is, all Vietnamese troops will be withdrawn from Cambodian territory while foreign states will cease their military aid to all Cambodian factions involved in the conflict. Our observer, Viktor Valentinov, has the following comments in this connection.

At present, no one can doubt any longer that the Vietnamese troops will really be withdrawn from Cambodia. The SRV Government has repeatedly presented its plan to complete its troop withdrawal by the end of September this year. Such an emphasis has even been displayed at the Vietnamese National Assembly session in Hanoi. The withdrawal will be held under strict international control. The problem regarding the establishment of the control mechanism will be discussed thoroughly at the international conference planned to be held in Paris on 3 or 4 July.

A more complicated issue is the cessation of military aid to the opposing Cambodian factions. Frankly speaking, with regard to one faction, this matter is not that complicated. This is because the Government of the State of Cambodia and all the countries which used to help this state, such as the Soviet Union and Vietnam, have stated firmly that as of September all military aid to Phnom Penh will cease. But concerning the opposing Cambodian factions, nothing has been clearly stated in this regard.

At a time when the Cambodian parties agreed that they would stop accepting foreign military aid, Washington suddenly made a move toward stalling the situation, that is, President Bush's government proposed that Congress consider giving additional military aid to the Son Sann and Sihanouk groups. But the U.S. legislators did not support this initiative from the White House. In my opinion, they have reasonably expressed their fear that such military aid to Sihanouk and Son Sann might eventually fall into the hands of the Pol Pot clique. Then the situation in Cambodia might deteriorate very seriously to the point that observers have surmised that a civil war might take place in Cambodia following the Vietnamese troop withdrawal.

It is difficult to guess what Washington expects in taking this step. Is it because the United States wants to ensure that it will have influence in Cambodia after the solution is reached? In my opinion, such a policy is extremely

suspicious: Does the U.S. Government want to destabilize the situation in Southeast Asia? If so, the road toward chaos and a civil war in Cambodia will certainly come through the supply of arms. In such a case, all those who have paid attention to the restoration of a lasting peace in Cambodia should show their thorough vigilance. Especially if we think about the fact that the White House is attempting to provide arms to the opposing Cambodian factions even without the approval of Congress. This means that the arms are to be provided through the CIA's secret networks.

Nevertheless, this U.S. stance is just an isolated one. As I have seen, other countries in general have all maintained a careful attitude regarding the agreement reached among the various Cambodian political forces. However, Washington's allies in Western Europe have shown their readiness to cease their aid. A prudent attitude has been professed by China which has stressed that following the Vietnamese troop withdrawal, the opposing Cambodian factions will no longer receive any military aid from it.

It was also learned a few days ago that even Thailand opposes any foreign military aid to the Cambodian political organizations. This is very important because during the past 10 years all military aid to the opposing Cambodian factions has been sent through Thailand. More importantly, the statement in this connection was issued by a representative of the Thai Armed Forces Command which is the intermediary between the aid donors and the opposing Cambodian factions. In my opinion, such an attitude in Bangkok will certainly serve as a new impetus for speeding up the solution to the Cambodian problem.

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Cited on Talks With Morocco's Filali

Ready for Lebanon Peace

LD2806211189 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, said that the Soviet Union will support any constructive efforts to put the Lebanese crisis on the track of a peace settlement. He made the statement as he received the foreign minister of Morocco, Abdellatif Filali, who has arrived in Moscow at a request from the three-nation committee of the Arab League on Lebanon.

Eduard Shevardnadze said that the Soviet Union was prepared to cooperate with the committee. Both government ministers emphasized the need for a stop to Israeli interference in Lebanon's affairs and for an early Israeli troop withdrawal. They exchanged views on the issue of a Middle East settlement. The Soviet foreign minister noted the Arab countries' readiness for reasonable compromise. He said now there had to be a reaction from Israel to the Arab world's goodwill move. Both foreign ministers called for convening an international conference on the Middle East.

'Unreservedly' Supports Arab League

LD2806224889 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, Soviet foreign minister, today conferred with Abdellatif Filali, Moroccan minister of foreign affairs and cooperation, who arrived in Moscow on a working visit on the instruction of the League of Arab States' trilateral committee on Lebanon.

Filali informed Shevardnadze about the steps taken by the committee to implement the decisions of the Arab conference in Casablanca. He acquainted his counterpart with the plan of action aimed at achieving national concord among the Lebanese.

Shevardnadze pointed out that the all-important thing now is to create maximum favourable international and regional conditions for the activity of the League of Arab States' trilateral committee. The Soviet Union unreservedly supports the committee's peace-making efforts and is prepared for interaction with it. Certainly, Lebanese should be helped to overcome discord and bitterness engendered by 14 years of the civil war.

There is the need, above all, to achieve a lasting ceasefire to be observed by all, which would open the door to a Lebanon-wide dialogue and a political solution to Lebanese problems, to preserving Lebanon as a single, sovereign, and territorially integral Arab state. Herein we see the main meaning of the trilateral committee's mission.

It is important that all Arab states maintain constructive cooperation and, primarily, the warring Lebanese factions. The good services of the international community are also needed. The Soviet Union will lend support to any constructive efforts aimed at diverting the Lebanese crisis into the channel of a peaceful settlement.

The sides underlined the need to stop Israel's interference in the affairs of Lebanon and speedily withdraw Israeli troops from all Lebanese territories. This is a key pre-condition for enabling Lebanese to get down to settling their affairs.

An exchange of views was held on the problem of the Middle Eastern settlement. Shevardnadze noted that the decisions of the Arab conference in Casablanca demonstrated that Arab countries have a considerable potential of readiness for sensible compromises. The ball is now in Israel's court, which should give an adequately constructive response to the good will displayed by Arabs. Filali concurred with this evaluation. The ministers spoke out in favour of fostering within the shortest possible time

the peace process, a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the convocation to this end of an international conference on the Middle East.

The sides also touched on other issues of world politics.

They considered the state of Soviet-Moroccan relations, stated that bilateral links were successfully developing, and identified reserves for their expansion. A mutual desire was voiced to upgrade cooperation in a variety of areas, develop and introduce its new forms.

More on Visit by Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani

Noninterference Pledge Behind Arms Deal

JN2706163789 Kuwait AL-QABAS in Arabic
26 Jun 89 p 22

[Text] Moscow (AL-QABAS)—Informed sources have stated that the Soviet Union has agreed to provide Iran with sophisticated weapons in return for a promise from Iranian Majlis Speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani not to interfere in the Soviet Muslim areas, the scenes of recent disturbances.

These sources added that Muslim fundamentalists influenced by Iran were behind the recent incidents in Uzbekistan. Therefore, the Soviet leadership is trying to contain the Iranian influence in the Islamic republics by improving its military and economic relations with Iran.

Analysts said the Soviet Union considers Iran the most important state in the Middle East. It has a 2,300-km common border with it and Iran's religious influence on 40 million Muslims living in the southern part of the Soviet Union greatly alarms Moscow.

In another development, U.S. Central Intelligence Agency sources said the Soviet Union agreed to sell Iraq two squadrons of the modern Su-27 fighter planes.

Experts believe that by this deal the Soviet Union seeks to maintain a balance in its cooperation with both Iraq and Iran. Moscow had earlier agreed to provide Iran with 300 T-72 and 150 T-54 tanks as well as 200 artillery pieces and 2,000 military vehicles.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani had said that Iran is seeking self-sufficiency in the field of defense and added that Iran is manufacturing its own aircraft, tanks, and missiles, but needs help in some areas.

Some diplomats stress that Iran's aim behind improving its relations with the Soviet Union is not purely military; it is seeking to create new political and strategic balances in the region.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Velayati on USSR Trip

NC2806080489 Moscow in Persian to Iran
1100 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] An Iranian delegation led by Mr 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani visited the Soviet Union 20-23 June at the invitation of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet. After official talks in Moscow, the Iranian delegation visited Leningrad and Baku.

Our Baku correspondent (Ismail Ghuliyev) interviewed the head of the Iranian delegation. Here is his report, which we received from Baku by telephone.

Answering a question on the results of his visit to the Soviet Union, Mr 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani said:

[Begin Hashemi-Rafsanjani recording] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. The agreements we reached with the Soviet leaders can prove immensely fruitful for both countries in the scientific, cultural, and economic fields, particularly in the areas of industry, commerce, defense, consular affairs, visits, border trade, and border exchanges.

We hope that the executives and officials will follow this up so that cooperation and the volume of exchanges between the two countries can expand. I am especially interested in scientific exchanges, student exchanges, cultural, and artistic exchanges which are important to us, and tourist exchanges. In my talks with your people and officials, I sensed that the Soviet people have very affectionate feelings toward the people of Iran. What I saw today in Azerbaijan was similar to what we see in our own cities. People have welcomed us with great cordiality and friendship and I have felt at home. Local officials have also been very friendly. We felt the same affection in our talks with Soviet leaders, especially Gorbachev. Even in Leningrad, which is very far from Iran, it appears that they recognize our revolution and have great affection for our people. They greeted us very warmly. I wish I could stay in your country longer so that I could become better acquainted with your people and officials. I hope such visits will increase greatly and that our agreements will be implemented to the maximum. [end recording]

A few minutes before the Iranian delegation left our country from Baku airport, our correspondent interviewed the Iranian foreign minister about the prospects of Iranian relations with Soviet Azerbaijan. Mr Velayati said:

[Begin Velayati recording] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. In view of the progress in the talks between Iran and the USSR, we hope that in the future, special relations with the neighboring provinces, or the neighboring Soviet republics, are stronger. In our talks this afternoon with the general secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, it was decided that visits between Iran and Soviet Azerbaijan

will increase. Commercial and border exchanges will be initiated and developed. Cultural and tourism exchanges will be expanded. The ties between the Islamic Republic and Soviet Azerbaijan will be broadened in various ways to become an example of friendly and goodneighborly ties between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the USSR. [end recording]

Trade Official on Cooperation

NC2806095889 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] The visit by Mr 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the speaker of the Islamic Majlis, to the USSR ended on 24 June. At the conclusion of this visit, important agreements were signed which open up new prospects for broadening Soviet-Iranian relations in various fields, including economic relations. Our correspondent, Mrs Siderova, interviewed (Anatoliy Yeloshiriyev), director of the Soviet section of the joint Soviet-Iranian permanent economic cooperation commission, and asked him to comment about the prospects for broadening economic relations between the two countries.

(Anatoliy Yeloshiriyev) stated that in the recent years, particularly in the past year, our relations and contacts with Iran have successfully increased. The results of the visit by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani to the USSR can be used to indicate the prospects for broadening Soviet-Iranian relations.

The documents signed during the visit cover a wide range of agreements on expanding various aspects of economic and commercial cooperation between Iran and the Soviet Union. These documents reflect, more than anything else, that Soviet-Iranian cooperation will be satisfactory and will provide great opportunities for the two countries.

Our correspondent asked about the bases on which Soviet-Iranian economic ties will be coordinated.

(Yeloshiriyev) noted that six economic agreements signed during Mr Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to Moscow, which envisage a long-term program of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between Iran and the Soviet Union until the year 2000, are the most important. The fact that these agreements were signed at this high a level indicates that both sides attach extraordinary importance to them.

As you are aware, the Soviet side was represented by Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Iranian side by Mr 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Majlis. In addition, a commercial agreement and one on cooperation in railroad transportation, including the construction of the Mashhad-Sarakhs-Tejan railroad, were signed.

(Yeloshiriyev) noted that the cooperation agreements are mainly in the traditional fields of energy, machine manufacture, metallurgy, and training of cadres. However a long-term program of cooperation in these fields opens a new chapter in relations. For example in the field of energy, we will embark on large-scale cooperation in the hydroenergetic [preceding word in English] field. What is more important in this program is that it stipulates not only general principles but particular tasks.

Iran's resumption of exports of natural gas to the Soviet Union may be considered the basis of Soviet-Iranian cooperation in the next few years. The Soviet Union has agreed to pay for the natural gas in advance. He added: In a long-term program, the principles for Soviet-Iranian economic ties have been explained and the various bases for broadening cooperation have been specified. For example, in the field of construction, the expansion and modernization of energy stations, industrial units, gas extraction plants, dams, transportation facilities, and other economic installations have been envisaged.

The two sides also agreed on the construction of various establishments on the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Soviet Union. In addition, they will promote cooperation in production, transfer of new technology, exchanges of experts, cadre training in institutes and centers in Iran, exchanges of scientific and technical information, and commercial exchanges, including border exchanges which will take place in various forms.

(Anatoliy Yeloshiriyev) said: In conclusion I wish to point out that the agreements signed will raise Soviet-Iranian economic ties to a level higher than ever before and will give impetus to the strengthening of our goodneighborly relations to the benefit of Iran and the Soviet Union.

Prospects for Trade Examined

18070322 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 23 Jun 89 p 5

[Article by M. Nepesov, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer: "USSR-Iran: Meeting One Another Halfway"]

[Text] Neighbors, like parents, are not chosen. It seems that this piece of wisdom from daily life is fully applicable to states with common borders as well. This is what history has decided and this is where we must begin.

Our country has been neighbors with Iran for centuries. The common border between the two countries extends 2,500 kilometers. It must be admitted that all kinds of things have happened over the past years... But one thing can be said with confidence: Immediately after October 1917 the Soviet state did and is still doing a great deal so that our border will be a border of good neighbors and cooperation. In particular, Iran's first agreement as a party with equal rights with a great power was signed in February

1921. It nullified all treaties, conventions, pacts, and agreements concluded by the former tsarist government with Persia, as the country was called at the time.

Since that time a foundation has been laid for Soviet-Iranian economic cooperation. Because of this such modern branches of the economy as ferrous metallurgy, the mining industry, and gas pipeline transportation have appeared in our neighbor country. The Isfahan metallurgical plant with a complete production cycle was put into operation in 1973, and only 4 years later capital expenditures on its construction were fully recouped. The situation with the Trans-Iranian main gas line is interesting. Its northern part, which has a branch to Tehran and beyond to the Soviet border over a distance of 600 kilometers, was constructed with our participation. The fact is that valuable casinghead gas—140 cubic meters for every ton of petroleum extracted—was being burned uselessly in torches. I had occasion to fly at night over southern Iran and see this fantastic but tragic sight. In the red and yellow tongues of flame the country's invaluable wealth was disappearing into the wind.

But it was different before 1980. In keeping with a Soviet-Iranian agreement 72 billion cubic meters of casinghead gas were exported to our country, to the Transcaucasus. These deliveries were paid for with Soviet services for creating a number of Iranian enterprises, grain elevators, and training centers. Moreover, an agreement was reached concerning "conventional" transit of Iranian gas to certain West European countries. In other words, we used this gas in our southern regions and an equivalent quantity from our own deposits was sold to Western Europe, which brought Iran significant currency revenues. This mutually advantageous transaction was halted.

But one must assume that the continuous fires from the Iranian oil fields will disappear in the near future. Following the will of the late R.M. Khomeyni, our country was visited by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Majlis and acting supreme commander of the Armed Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

"We are ready," declared M.S. Gorbachev, addressing this high-level Iranian guest, "to go as far as Iran is prepared to go to meet halfway." Judging from the atmosphere of the Soviet-Iranian high-level negotiations, the readiness is mutual.

Expansion of Business Ties Viewed

LD2806162989 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Some 60 large Iranian commercial and industrial firms expressed the wish to develop business cooperation with Soviet partners. Asadollah Asghar Uladi president of the Iranian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry, said this at the meeting with leaders of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry here today. He leads a delegation of Iranian businessmen representing Iran's chemical, light and food industries. It is the first time that the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry is playing host to such a representative delegation of Iranian businessmen.

Prospects for the development of economic cooperation between the USSR and Iran and the role of the chambers of commerce of the two countries in this process were discussed during the talks. It was noted that the development of border trade is one of the most effective forms of developing bilateral business relations. Soviet enterprises in the border zone (in Turkmenia, in Azerbaijan) have now been given broad rights and show interest in trade with Iranian firms. But the development of this form of cooperation is so far checked by the lack of information about the export possibilities of both countries. In this connection there are preparations for an exhibition of Iranian export goods to be held in Baku, Azerbaijan, whereas enterprises of Turkmenia and Azerbaijan will participate in an international fair soon to be held in Tehran.

Assadollah Asghar Uladi noted that documents signed during the recent visit of the head of the Iranian Government to the USSR attach much importance to the development of bilateral trade. "We shall find ways and means to step up commercial and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union", he said.

More on Katushev 11-13 Jun Visit to Iraq

PM2106101189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic ties, was on a visit to the Republic of Iraq 11-13 June. Talks were held with Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Sa'dun Hammadi and Minister of Finance Hikmat 'Umar Mukhalif al-Hadithi on questions of the further development of Soviet-Iraqi trade and economic cooperation.

Sikh Separatist Actions Discussed

18070316 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 1

[Article by Nikolay Pastukhov: "Terrorists in Isolation"]

[Text] Residents of the Indian state of Punjab are more and more resolutely rebuffing the bandits who had relied on inflaming intercommunal hostility in the state, achieving the secession of Punjab from India, and creating a marionette "state of Halistan" out of it.

Since the detachments of bandits are comprised mainly of overseas Sikhs, the organizers of the provocations were hoping that the local Sikh population would support them. This did not happen. Then mass terror

began—an attempt to instill fear and thus break the resistance of the Sikhs and Hindus who were presenting a unified front. This did not happen. This is shown by a recent example.

They were preparing for another bloody crime. But it was possible to prevent it, for dozens of people who never knew one another before—natives of Punjab, both Sikhs and Hindus—resolutely stood up against the terrorists. Six armed extremists stopped a bus carrying 65 passengers. The bandits demanded that all the Hindus leave the bus and line up on the side of the road that runs from Amritsar to Pathankot. The terrorists did not conceal their intentions—to mercilessly shoot the Hindus. But not this time! Unarmed passengers in the bus, Sikhs, rose to the defense of the Hindus. Two were killed straight out and two others were wounded. All the passengers on the bus joined in the fight against the terrorists. The extremists fled in disgrace... This is not the first case in past months when people have decisively rebuffed bandits who were relying on inflaming intercommunal discord in Punjab.

Although the savagery of the terrorists is continuing, cases from real life convincingly show that signs of improvement of the whole situation in the state of Punjab have begun to appear. Here is what the director of the Punjab police, K.P.Sh. Gill, had to say in this regard:

"The people are ceasing to give in to the terrorists, who do not evoke mortal fear in them as they have in the past."

Thus pro-Western terrorists sent to Punjab from Pakistan are becoming increasingly isolated.

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Continues Visit to USSR

Talks With Gorbachev Reported

LD2806125589 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1124 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met today in Moscow for detailed talks.

They discussed joint tasks for the further deepening of the fraternal relations between the GDR and the USSR and topical questions of close cooperation in the international arena. The interlocutors reaffirmed the firm desire of the two fraternal parties and states, united through unswerving friendship and solidarity and founded on the mutuality of their points of view on the principle questions of foreign policy and socialist construction, to expand purposefully, also in the future, bilateral relations which are on a traditionally high level, for the well-being of their peoples.

Erich Honecker assessed that the socialist development of the GDR is characterized by political stability and economic dynamism, also in this, the 40th year of its existence. Under the leadership of the SED the workers of the GDR will make successful efforts to shape further developed socialist society, and creative initiatives will develop in accordance with the principle "the stronger the socialism, the more secure the peace." The continuation of the proven course of the unity of economic and social policies gives stimulus to high performances and leads to social security for everyone. The convincing results of the local elections on 7 May and the successful running of the youth meeting at Whitsun in Berlin reflected the complete confidence of the population in the policies of the party. In preparation for the 12th SED Congress in May 1990 the resolutions of the 8th SED Central Committee meeting are aimed at further increasing the economic power and attractiveness of socialism in the GDR.

Erich Honecker reaffirmed the unanimous support of the SED and of all the people of the GDR for the course of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th CPSU conference for the renewal of Soviet society. With perestroyka, the CPSU has tackled an extremely difficult, complicated, but necessary process, which was of decisive significance for the strengthening of socialism and the safeguarding of peace in the world.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke about the manifold tasks which the communists and all social forces in the Soviet Union have set for themselves in the present stage of socialist construction. Mastering them successfully is of historic consequence for the country. He outlined the course and the results of the Congress of People's Deputies and the meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the resolutions passed at them. The Congress of People's Deputies was an expression of the gradual implementation of the resolutions of the 19th CPSU conference and bore witness to the support of the Soviet population for the policies of the party.

Mikhail Gorbachev ackknowledged the upcoming 40th anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic as an important event in the social life of the two peoples. He emphasized that the existence of the socialist German state, which consistently pursues a peace-loving foreign policy, rich in initiative, and which is decisively in favor of respect for the existing political realities in Europe, exerts a beneficial influence on the situation in Europe and in the world. The stable and dynamic development of the GDR, on the basis of the resolutions of the 11th SED Congress, is, on the whole, of considerable importance for the strengthening of socialism. In evaluating fulfillment of the tasks arising from their meeting in September 1988, Erich Honecker

and Mikhail Gorbachev assessed with satisfaction that both sides are working intensively to meet the commitments which reach far into the future.

The two politicians expressed their satisfaction with the state of fraternal relations between the SED and the CPSU and between the GDR and the USSR, which are unprecedented in their intensity and variety. The firm basis and the motor for the further formation of relations between the two states and peoples is the trusting cooperation of the two parties. Cooperation on all levels—in accordance with the principles of equality, independence, and self-government, and of responsibility to one's own people, mutual trust, and mutual advantage—is a fundamental achievement of socialism and a guarantor for successful progress. The continual exchange of opinions and experiences is of special significance in the present times.

The highest representatives of the GDR and the USSR paid tribute to the continuous development of economic and scientific-technological cooperation. With the concept for economic and scientific-technological cooperation between the GDR and the USSR up to the year 2000, the basic guidelines have been clearly laid down for division of labor between the two states up to the turn of the century. Specialization and cooperation are to be deepened, the structure of trade perfected, progressive forms of foreign trade cooperation developed more broadly, the technological level and quality of mutual supplies are to be raised, and direct relations developed. Both sides agreed that the fact that cooperation between the two countries, which is marked by stability and dynamism, is more and more distinguished by the widespread application and economic exploitation of high technology, especially modern micro-electronics and computer technology, is of great significance for the present and the future.

The coordination of the economic plans for the period from 1991 to 1995 creates stable bases for further deepening cooperation between the two countries, having regard for the growing tasks and the new economic circumstances which are arising. Economic and scientific-technological cooperation are being further developed at a high level also in the coming 5-year-plan period; trade is being increased and cooperative relations developed. It was noted with satisfaction that relations in the ideological and intellectual-cutural sphere are being purposefully deepened. A visible expression of this is the signing of the "agreement on the long-term program of cooperation in the social science sector between scientists and research collectives of the GDR and the USSR" of December 1988 and of the "government agreement on the creation and work of a GDR culture and information center in the USSR" of June 1989.

The planned concluding of a "long-term program of basic tendencies for cultural cooperation up to the year 2000" will lend new impetus to the efforts for an increase in the effectiveness and quality of extensive cooperation in this sphere. The two sides are determinedly making the preparations for the "Days of GDR Culture" to be held in the USSR in October this year and the "Days of Soviet Culture" to be held in the GDR in June 1990, which will be organized as significant high points in the chronicle of friendly relations between the two states and peoples.

Erich Honecker and Mikhail Gorbachev were in agreement in their assessment of important international develoments. The two politicians stressed that prime attention will be devoted to further deepening bilateral and multilateral cooperation between the fraternal countries in the interests of strengthening socialism. In spite of the variety which was revealed in the path toward forming the new social order, the same aims, ideals, and values serve as a reliable basis for it.

The GDR and the USSR are determined to intensify their cooperation in the implementation of the joint peace policy of the Warsaw Pact states. They believe that the positive tendencies in the development of the international situation are the result of the dynamic foreign policy of the USSR, the GDR, and the other socialist countries, and of the activities of those states and social forces in the world which are guided by reason and realism. Now what matters is to give the disarmament process continuity and new dynamism. Both politicians came out in favor of purposeful efforts by all states to overcome the outdated policy of confrontation and in favor of the implementation of the new political thinking in international relations, which replaces old enemy images with cooperation as partners in the securing of peace.

Mikhail Gorbachev informed Erich Honecker of his personal impressions of his recent visit to the FRG and of his negotiations with leading FRG figures. He expressed his conviction that an ever-increasing number of FRG citizens are becoming sincere followers of peace, friendship, and good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, the GDR, and the other socialist states on the basis of recognition of realities and an understanding of the need for joint solutions to problems affecting all of humanity. Erich Honecker evaluated Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to the FRG as an important contribution to the further improvement of the situation in Europe. The goals and principles of securing peace, of disarmament, and of detente, formulated in the joint statement signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl, are fully supported by the GDR. For its part, the GDR is also striving for the development of beneficial cooperation and a trusting atmosphere between the European peoples, including the FRG, the chairman of the GDR State Council stressed.

Both sides were in agreement that all measures for the removal of nuclear and chemical weapons and for the reduction of conventional armaments must start from the need to guarantee equal security for all countries, and

to ensure full respect for the sovereignty and the territorial intergrity and independence of each country within its present borders. With its far-reaching proposals and prior concessions on disarmament in the conventional sphere, the GDR, along with the USSR and the other socialist countries, is manifesting its determination to dismantle the military confrontation and to make the peace more secure. Its decisions on the reduction of armed forces by 1990, unilaterally and independent of negotiations, and on a considerable reduction in defense expenditure, must receive a suitable response from the NATO countries.

The two sides described the proposal on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe, put forward by U.S. President George Bush at the NATO summit in Brussels as a step in the right direction. The GDR and the USSR welcome any initiative which can accelerate the talks in Vienna and contribute to results on the basis of equal and undiminished security of all involved. They are strongly in favor of an immediate start to negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons, against all measures for their modernization, and for the complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons. Erich Honecker and Mikhail Gorbachev once again affirm the support of the GDR and the USSR for the significant resolutions of the Berlin meeting of the committee of foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact states on the reduction and complete removal of nuclear and chemical weapons, on a radical reduction of forces and conventional arms. The new initiatives of the USSR on the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons are a further step on the path toward the creation of a world without war and violence.

The discussion took place in a spirit of traditional friendship and fraternal understanding.

Leaders Make Speeches at Luncheon

LD2806182389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, a luncheon was given today in honor of Honecker, general secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee, chairman of the Council of State of the GDR. On the Soviet side the luncheon was attended by comrades Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Medvedev, Slyun'kov, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and other officials. On the GDR side the luncheon was attended by officials accompanying comrade Honecker on his trip. During the luncheon, held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Erich Honecker exchanged speeches that were applauded. On the same day the GDR leader left Moscow for Magnitogorsk to take part in the celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the city. On his trip the guest is accompanied by Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo, chairman of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. At the airport comrade Honecker was seen off by Yakovlev, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

'Understanding' in Leaders Talk

LD2806183789 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today met Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic.

Gorbachev, who came to the meeting right from the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told how the consideration of the structure and a new composition of the Soviet Government is proceeding. Perestroika in our country is nothing short of a peaceful revolution aimed at modifying all facets of society's life, he said. We reached the conclusion about the need for sweeping reforms—economic, political and judicial-legal, and transformations in the state structure. Much will hinge in the years ahead on perestroika in the party ranks.

I recall how I was overcome with shyness when I mounted the rostrum of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses for the first time. Many young people from various segments of society showed themselves brilliant speakers these days, boldly joined in the debate and spoke about sore subjects.

During the discussion of the issues of economic cooperation both sides positively appraised the results achieved and, at the same time, drew attention to the need to build up interaction between scientists and production workers in the key directions of modern scientific-technical progress—in electronics, robotics, and in the development of high technologies.

In the sphere of international relations both sides will go ahead, at [words indistinct] organisation, with the efforts to better the situation in Europe and preserve a sense of momentum in the disarmament process. Any measures aimed at eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and at reducing conventional armaments should proceed from [word indistinct] ensure equal security for all states, respect for the sovereignty and integrity of each country within its present borders. The importance was pointed out of building a sound economic base for the concept of a common European home, which rules out any discrimination.

Gorbachev shared impressions of his recent visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and talks with West German leaders.

Honecker commended this visit as a meaningful contribution to the casue of preserving stable peace in Europe. The GDR supports the goals and principles of assuring peace, disarmament and good neighbourliness, which were formulated in the joint statement signed upon the results of the visit. For its part, the GDR applies efforts

to increase cooperation and build trust among European countries, including West Germany, relying on the recognition of the European realities and peoples' right to a social choice.

The talk was held in the atmosphere of mutual understanding and cordiality. [Moscow television service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 28 June in its "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a similar report which adds:

"Erich Honecker said that the communists and the working people of the GDR followed each day of the work of the congress with unabated interest. All its basic materials were published in the press of the republic. This is not simply a need for political information. Behind this stands a profound interest in concluding the restructuring with success. Our people are well aware of the fact that it will also represent a success of the GDR and the cause of socialism and peace. Comrade Honecker spoke about what the GDR people and its party and state leadership are now working on. This work is developing under the slogan: "Combination of continuity and renewal."]

Gorbachev Receives Honecker

PM2906103989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 1989 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report on the 28 June talks between M.S. Gorbachev and GDR leader Honecker entitled "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met 28 June with E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council.

The interlocutors confirmed the intention of the two fraternal parties and states, united by traditional friendship and relying on common views on fundamental questions of socialist construction and international politics, to purposefully develop all-around cooperation between themselves.

A considerable part of the discussion was occupied with an exchange of information. Comrade Gorbachev, who came to the meeting from the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, spoke about the progress of examining the structure and composition of the new Soviet Government. He stressed that the Supreme Soviet, its chambers, committees, and commissions face huge and complex tasks: to fulfill the instructions of the Congress of People's Deputies and to implement the whole wealth of ideas expressed at it. The solving of the complex problems which we encountered depends on how quickly and effectively the reestablished bodies of power commence their work, first and foremost in the socioeconomic sphere and in interethnic relations.

The restructuring, which is under way in our country, is nothing short of a peaceful revolution aimed at the transformation of all aspects of society's life.

We reached the conclusion about the need for radical reforms—economic, political, and judicial and legal—and transformations in the sphere of the national-state structure. Whatever difficulties may have to be overcome in this, the firm conviction has developed in our society that there is no other way and no alternative to restructuring. In the future much will hinge on restructuring in the party ranks. Having come forward as an initiator of this process, it is obliged to be ahead of social expectations, it has no right to lag behind.

We have enormous potential both in production and in human terms, Comrade Gorbachev stressed. Restructuring has already put forward many interesting, bold, and politically aware people. I recall how I was overcome with shyness when, for the first time, I approached the rostrum of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, he said. Many young people from various social stratas showed themselves to be brilliant speakers these days. They boldly joined in the debate and spoke about sore subjects. Lenin had a very profound thought: The working class reaches socialism through democracy, but socialism itself is not possible without democracy. And it is precisely this thought that we now, strictly speaking, wish to implement in practice in specific historical conditions.

Erich Honecker said that the communists and the working people of the GDR followed each day of the Congress with unabated interest. All of its basic materials were published in the press of the republic. This is not simply a need for political information. Behind this stands a profound interest in concluding the restructuring with success.

Our people are well aware of the fact that it will also represent a success for the GDR and for the cause of socialism and peace. Comrade Honecker spoke about what the GDR people and its party and state leadership are now working on. This work is developing under the slogan of combining continuity and renewal. Prime importance is given to solving specific socioeconomic tasks and also to the provision of reliable production and scientific and technical groundwork in order to make a breakthrough to new frontiers of socialist development. The question of preparation for the next, 12th, SED congress, which will be held in May next year, has been put on to a practical footing. The party and the public are concentrating attention on the approaching 40th anniversary of the GDR. All of us, of course, wish this date to be marked by great and positive results in all spheres of society.

M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the GDR's 40th anniversary is an important political event not only for the people of the republic, but also for the Soviet people. Our

countries have travelled the entire postwar period hand-in-hand, they shared difficulties and struggled for common objectives. And to see the real successes of the German comrades in the economy, culture, and other spheres of social life gives us great pleasure today. The existence and stability of the German state of workers and peasants represent an important element of the development of socialism and strengthening peace in Europe.

During the discussion of economic cooperation, both sides positively appraised the results achieved so far, and, at the same time, noted the need to step up interaction between scientists and production workers in the key directions of modern scientific and technical progress in the sphere of electronics, robotization, and the development of top technologies. In this respect both countries have great potential and it is now a matter of making their economic mechanism further their full development. It was agreed that these and other tasks will be discussed in a concrete way during the forthcoming meeting of the chairmen of the USSR and GDR State Planning Committees.

The leaders of the two countries spoke in favor of further developing interaction between the USSR and the GDR in the intellectual sphere, along the line of scientific institutions and public organizations, contacts between citizens and young people. The great importance of cooperation between the USSR and the GDR in the cause of meeting the cultural requirements of Soviet citizens of German nationality was emphasized.

In the sphere of international relations the two sides, together with their Warsaw Pact allies, will continue efforts to improve the situation in Europe and will continue the process of disarmament. The measures aimed at the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons and at the reduction of conventional weapons should proceed also from the need to ensure equal security for all states, to respect the sovereignty and integrity of each country within its present borders.

The importance of placing a sound economic foundation, which would exclude any discrimination, under the conception of the common European house was noted.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev shared his impressions of his recent visit to the FRG and his talks with the West German leaders.

He expressed the conviction that an increasingly higher number of FRG citizens will become heartfelt supporters of peace, friendship, and goodneighborliness with the Soviet Union, the GDR, and other socialist states on the basis of realization of the realities and of the need to jointly solve tasks which concern all of mankind.

E. Honecker highly appraised this trip as a considerable contribution to the cause of preserving stable peace in Europe. The GDR supports the objectives and principles of ensuring peace, disarmament, and goodneighborliness, which were formulated in the joint declaration signed on the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to FRG. For its part the republic makes efforts to develop cooperation and confidence among European countries, including the FRG, on the basis of recognizing European realities and the people's right to social choice.

M.S. Gorbachev wished E. Honecker an interesting and fruitful stay in Magnitogorsk, where he has been invited to celebrate the town's 60th anniversary as an honored guest and an international participant in the construction of the metallurgical combine at the beginning of the 1930s. Recalling that time, E. Honecker said that participating in the building of Magnitka had a great influence on him both as a human being and as a communist. The work was hard, but was carried out with great enthusiasm.

The conversation took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cordiality. Participating on the Soviet side were E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.M. Falin, and G.KH. Shakhnazarov. On the GDR side were O. Fischer, G. Sieber, F.-J. Herrmann, and G. Koenig.

Honecker Arrives in Magnitogorsk

LD2806170789 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1555 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Magnitogorsk (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the GDR's state council coming from Moscow, arrived in Magnitogorsk this evening. He is to take part in the celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the "V.I. Lenin" metallurgical combine and the city of Magnitorgorsk.

During his visit to the steel town situated in the southern Urals, Erich Honecker will be accompanied by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

Attends Friendship Dinner in Magnitogorsk

LD2806211889 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1959 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Magnitogorsk (ADN)—A warm GDR-Soviet friendship meeting was held this evening immediately after Erich Honecker's arrival in Magnitogorsk. During a welcoming dinner given by the hosts, (A.P. Litovchenko), second secretary of the Chelyabinsk oblast party committee, again warmly welcomed Erich Honecker and thanked him for taking part in the celebrations to mark the 60th anniversary of Magnitogorsk. [passage omitted]

Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, expressed his gratitude for the warm reception given to him in Magnitogorsk

and the Chelyabinsk region. He was pleased to have returned here to the place of his work as a young communist. His stay at that time had a great influence on his future political development. His stay had subsequently, when he was incarcerated in a fascist prison and when Hitler's troops stood before Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingard, given him the certainty that the Soviet people would be victorious over the aggressor because he had known what huge industry had been established in the Urals and what heoric people lived in that country.

Visits Magnitogorsk Iron-Steel Combine

LD2906075189 East Berlin ADN International Service in Russian 0532 GMT 29 Jun 89

[Text] Magnitogorsk (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, and his entourage today began their visit to Magnitogorsk with a visit to the "V.I. Lenin" iron and steel combine.

On a tour of the extensive plant installations and the building site of the new converter steel works, the guests were told about the modernization and the growth of the industrial giant, on whose preliminary construction work the present leading representative of the GDR had worked, together with a group of young German communists in the summer of 1931.

The guests made visits to the blast furnace installations and the cold rolling mill, where in 1971 Erich Honecker was decorated with the honorary medal "Magnitika work veteran".

Immediately after the tour of the steel plant the GDR guests went into the museum of the history of the iron and steel combine. Here the impressive construction of this significant industrial center in the USSR is documented. At the beginning the guests were shown a film, which amateur filmmakers assembled from archives and historic photographs, and which portrays the development of the combine.

A meeting with veterans is also planned in the museum. In addition the GDR guests handed over to the museum historic documents on the development of the plant.

Visits Kara-Dyr Viewing Platform

LD2906100489 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0812 GMT 29 Jun 89

[Excerpts] Magnitogorsk (ADN)—For every guest of honor visiting Magnitogorsk a visit to the viewing platform of the Kara-Dyr, the "Black Mountain," approximately one kilometer from Europe, which begins on the other side of the Ural river, is an obligatory item on the program. Today it was also the first stop and where Erich Honecker began his tour of the "V.I. Lenin" metallurgical combine. [passage omitted]

What impressions do you have, Comrade Honecker, what are your feelings given the fact that once upon a time you helped with the construction here, Soviet journalists asked the guest. Erich Honecker willingly gave an account: For us it was then a great and also a romantic thing. We dug here day and night, we shovelled, we tranported. The hammers and nails boomed day and night. Subbotniks determined our working routine. Thus we made our contribution to a wonderful task, a great goal. The thing that sticks in my mind most from this year of 1931 is the enthusiasm that filled us, which the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] members had captured, for a new time. [passage omitted]

Returning to level ground after visiting the blast furnace platform, Erich Honecker found his path crossed by a few female workers. They shook hands in friendship. One of the female workers stressed how pleased she was with the visit. "And I am glad to be here with you again," replied the visitor.

The last place where there were warm meetings with workers from the combine had been this morning at the Kalwalzstrasse.

West Europe

Turkey's Yilmaz Cited on Soviet 'Goodwill' Gesture

TA2806175289 Ankara TRT Television Network in Turkish 1700 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Foreign Minister Mesut Yilmaz has said that it is not a question of the Soviet Union mediating officially between Turkey and Bulgaria. He said: The Soviet Union made a unilateral move, a move of goodwill.

The foreign minister was replying to reporters' questions after he emerged from the Council of Ministers meeting. He stressed that Turkey appreciates the Soviet Union's goodwill initiatives regarding the Bulgarian Turks issue.

Asked to comment on the talks held with Soviet Ambassador Albert Chernyshev, Yilmaz said: We explained our own position. He will hold further contacts. If he sees a possibility of reconciliation between the positions, then the status of mediator might be seriously considered.

Asked whether there are any signs that Bulgaria might change its position on negotiations without preconditions, Foreign Minister Yilmaz said: There is no reason for being optimistic at this stage.

Yilmaz said Chernyshev brought a verbal message from Gorbachev, and that he [Yilmaz] delivered this message to Prime Minister Ozal. The foreign minister did not disclose the contents of the message.

PRAVDA Reports on Maksim Gorkiy Accident

PM2206151989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[V. Chertkov article: "Ice Ram. All Passengers on the 'Maksim Gorkiy' Rescued"]

[Text] The "Maksim Gorkiy" turboship on a cruise with West German tourists on board was holed 20 June in the Sea of Greenland at 0120 Moscow time, latitude 77 degrees, 37 minutes north and 4 degrees, 10 minutes east. The vessel was traveling from Iceland to Spitsbergen.

I visited this bleak area quite recently. The western shore of Spitsbergen is surrounded with a heavy ice floe, the edge of which is constantly crumbling. But you cannot describe the pieces of ice that are broken off as crumbs. They made a striking impression as they were rolled back by the stem of the nuclear-powered "Rossiya" and were occasionally reminiscent of icebergs. "God forbid that any other vessel should encounter them"—those were the thoughts that slipped into my mind.

It was probably a lump of ice like that which found itself in the path of the Maksim Gorkiy somewhere around 100 or so miles from Barentsburg. The hull was damaged below the waterline and three sections were flooded. The SOS signal flew through the air. Fog lay over the sea and added to the disturbing nature of the situation. The 952 people on board the ship (of whom 377 were crew members) did not panic, knowing that the ship was equipped with powerful rescue systems. But be that as it may, it must not be forgotten that the calamity occurred in northern latitudes. The temperature of the water is only plus 2 and the air is also as "warm"—we can still remember clearly how their dip ended for the crew of the Soviet submarine.

The bow is 5 meters lower than the stern and the ship is listing 3 degrees to the starboard side. A list in virtually calm water affects the nerves and forces one, I felt, to abandon one's psychological equilibrium—the sea is the sea. The distress signal had scarcely been received when the levers activated in such cases began to operate. Aircraft carrying inflatable rafts flew up from Murmansk and Barentsburg, but it was not necessary to drop them. The Norwegian rescue ship Senja, equipped with helicopters carrying divers, was already at the scene of the disaster. It also rescued all the passengers. The Admiral Levchenko, a large anisubmarine warfare ship, and assorted vessels—the Pechenga, Kapitan Nazaryev, Deviator, Professor Vize, and Vsevolod Berezkin—came to the aid of the Maksim Gorkiy. It was as if a call rolled out across the Arctic water: "Faster, faster! Let's not lose a single man!."

Yu.M. Volmer, minister of the maritime fleet, spoke with M. Galimov, captain of the Maksim Gorkiy, yesterday at midday by satellite. The latter reported that there had been no human casualties and that some of the crew had been evacuated.

Minister: "Check for people once again. Anything can happen in this alarming situation."

Captain: "Of course. We are forming a team of 110-120 men who will strive to save the ship."

Minister: "Try to patch the hole in the second section."

The Norwegian divers discovered three holes with the following dimensions: 75 by 3 cm; 60 by 4 cm; and 6 by 15 cm. The latter was caused by a glancing blow. If they succeed in just temporarily closing the largest "hole," the ship will travel under its own steam to Barentsburg at a speed of 4-6 knots.

Minister: "When will the evacuation of the crew be completed?"

Captain: "In the next 1 and 1/2-2 hours. The seamen are in control of the situation. Provided there isn't a storm."

Maksim Gorkiy Heads for FRG Port for Repairs

LD2806201189 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Oslo June 28 TASS—The Soviet passenger liner Maksim Gorkiy, escorted by the rescue tug Zarya, left the Coles bay in the Is Fjord on the Spitsbergen islands on Wednesday afternoon, TASS correspondent Stanislav Tikhomirov has been told at the Soviet Consulate in Barentsburg.

The Maksim Gorkiy struck an iceberg in the Barents Sea, south west of Spitsbergen, on June 20. The iceberg made three holes in the ship, the largest of them being six metres long.

Norwegian rescue services rushed to the scene immediately after intercepting the ship's distress signal. All the 575 West German tourists, carried by the Maksim Gorkiy, and part of the Soviet crew were picked up by the Norwegians. There were no casualties.

Now that the holes in the ship have been temporarily plugged and the water has been pumped out of the flood compartments, the ship is leaving for the West German port of Bremerhaven where its hull will be overhauled.

The Maksim Gorkiy is expected to reach the port of destination on July 4.

Now the liner is carrying 123 crew needed to ensure the voyage. The other 250 crew have left for Odessa, the ship's port of registry, by Aeroflot planes.

Correspondent Views European Election Outcome

PM2306115789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 89 Second Edition p 7

[Vladimir Bolshakov dispatch under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "After the Elections to the European Parliament"]

[Text] Paris, 22 Jun—Characterizing the elections to the European Parliament, held recently in the 12 "Common Market" countries, LE FIGARO remarked that this organ has "turned pink and green." This sarcastic observation by the right-wingers' well-known mouthpiece reflects their universal displeasure at the fact that right-wingers have ended up in such an obvious minority for the first time in the entire history of the EC's legislative assembly. Of the 518 elected deputies, 182 are socialists, 42 are communists, and 38 are members of various parties which advocate environmental protection. This, as Rudi Arndt (FRG), leader of the Socialist Group in the previous parliament, declared, will enable the socialists' representative to seek the presidency of the European Parliament, while the "Greens" have already applied to fill the current vacancy for vice president.

In a coalition with communists and "Greens" the socialists will be able to "build the Europe that they want to build," as L. Fabius, president of the French National Assembly, who headed the French Socialists' list in the elections, declared. The proximity to this proposed coalition of the centrist "European People's Party," consisting chiefly of Christian Democrats, will enable the Left, so EC Commission President Jacques Delors believes, to use the European Parliament's legislative levers to secure adoption of urgent social programs that have been deferred year after year. Even though these levers are not strong enough to "turn around" a Europe in which monopoly capital holds the commanding positions, all West European commentators consider the European Parliament's leftward shift a very major development, particularly in connection with the plans to create a "single European market" by 1993.

For many of those asked to vote for European Parliament deputies a "unified Europe" still seems a chimera whose actual parameters are very vague. It is no coincidence, therefore, that of the 240 million registered voters in Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark, Spain, Italy, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, the FRG, and France an average of 56 percent voted. The turnout was much lower in France at 50.4 percent, and was just 37 percent in Britain. Such massive abstention was a form of protest against the Europe of corporations and big banks.

The Old World's big capital sees the creation of the "single European market" as an opportunity to come out with new strength against its U.S., Japanese, and other competitors within the framework of the world's largest economic grouping consisting of 12 countries. For the ordinary "Eurovoter," in whichever of the 12 countries he voted, all these calculations appear threatening rather than promising—who knows how things will turn out there, in the "new Europe"?

The election struggle in many countries was for all political parties an extremely important trial of strength on the national scale, particularly where their own parliamentary elections are expected in the very near future. Of paramount significance in this context was the success of the British Laborites, who badly squeezed M. Thatcher's supporters and secured a dozen more seats in the European Parliament than in the 1984 elections. The fate of the British Tories also befell the Danish Conservative Party headed by Prime Minister P. Schluter and the right-wing parties in Ireland, Spain, and the FRG. In West Germany the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union bloc lost more than 8 percent of its votes, thus giving the Social Democrats hope of long-awaited revenge.

Despite their Europe-wide victory, in a number of countries the socialists yielded their positions to right-wingers. This is what happened in France, for example, where the Socialist Party lagged behind the united bloc of right-wing parties, getting just 23.69 percent of the votes.

Communists did not put up candidates in all 12 countries. In Spain and Portugal they formed a bloc with other parties, and this brought them success. In France and Italy the results could have been better for the Communists. In the 1984 elections the French Communist Party obtained more than 11 percent of the votes, but this time it got just 7.85 percent. Correspondingly, the Italian Communist Party got 33.3 percent in 1984 and 27.6 percent this year. The overall result for the communist group in the European Parliament is a loss of six seats. Of course, this is not a tragedy but, rather, an indicator of the difficulties which communist parties, including the largest in Europe, are now having to encounter because of a whole series of internal and external circumstances beyond their control. In any event, their influence in their own countries is stable, and municipal elections, for example, provide considerable evidence of this.

Brutents Views Socialist International

LD2406062389 Moscow TASS in English 0618 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Text] Stockholm June 24 TASS—The positions of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) and parties grouped in the Socialist International on many international issues are close or coincide, an alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee told reporters at the Soviet Embassy in the Swedish capital Friday.

Karen Brutents, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, had come to Sweden to attend a Socialist International congress as a CPSU representative.

At the news conference he said that speakers at the congress set forth many constructive proposals aimed at solving global problems facing mankind. He added that cooperation between the two trends of the working class movement can enrich both sides.

Brutents said that the congress documents will be attentively studied in the Soviet Union.

The official had a "useful exchange of views" with Socialist International President Willy Brandt, Sweden's Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, and the leaders of a number of parties grouped in that organisation.

He said the CPSU now cooperates, on a bilateral basis, with some 40 socialist, social democratic and labour parties.

At reporters' request, Brutents spoke about the ways the political and economic reforms will be implemented in Soviet society in accordance with the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

He confirmed that during his stay in Stockholm he had met Yasir 'Abd Rabbuh, member of the Palestine Liberation Organisation Executive Committee, and Shim'on Peres, chairman of the Labour Party and deputy prime minister of Israel.

During these meetings, the sides exchanged views on Middle East settlement. Brutents said that this settlement should guarantee the right to self-determination for the Palestinian people.

Latin America & Caribbean

Paraguayan Communist Party Figure Interviewed

Part 1

PY2306035489 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 22 Jun 89

[First part of interview with Antonio Rivera, member of the Propaganda Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party, by Mikhail Tikhon; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Tikhon] Comrade Antonio Rivera, I want to tell you that for us it is a great pleasure to have you again on Radio Moscow after many years. Obviously, we would like to ask you to share with us—when I say with us, I mean with our listeners—your views on the new situation in your country, Paraguay. What changes have taken place in your country since General Rodriguez' election as president?

[Rivera] Well, first we should consider the situation in Paraguay before the 2 February coup, which was critical. Stroessner's dictatorship was one of the most savage in Latin America. General Stroessner and his clique personally controlled power in the country. This clique was led by Adan Godoy Jimenez; [J. Eugenio] Jacquet; and that sinister character, Pastor Coronel, chief of the Paraguayan Police Investigative Department.

These guys—it might seem a little rude to call them guys, but it is realistic—abused their absolute power in our country. They used to violate every human right; they persecuted peasants, students, and workers; they even broke into churches to beat the faithful who were praying for freedom in our country.

The basic change that followed Stroessner's ouster was the introduction of some freedoms that had been totally restricted in our country. There have still been no concrete actions toward socioeconomic change, but the people's pressure—especially that exerted by the peasants, who have the most serious problems—has been instrumental in obtaining land for peasants.

Peasants now often come to Asuncion to air their demands in an organized fashion. They are asking for the land that used to belong to their ancestors and that was expropriated by the gang of Stroessnerist criminals.

[Tikhon] What is the current status of the Paraguayan economy?

[Rivera] Well, the Paraguayan economy is disastrous. There is a rather high inflation rate and unemployment. Stroessner left the Paraguayan economy in ruins because of the shameful robberies committed by him and his clique. They cleaned out the country's funds. Paraguayan media repeatedly report on charges stemming from those crimes. The Paraguayan press is now performing a significant role in reporting all the atrocities and robberies of Stroessner's regime.

[Tikhon] Has the dismantling of the repressive apparatus already started in Paraguay?

[Rivera] Not yet, because there are still former members of the dictatorship who managed to survive within the curent structure. Some of the most notorious figures are standing trial, such as, I repeat, Pastor Coronel, former chief of the Police Investigative Department; Lucilo Benitez, a sinister torturer; and some others. The dismantling of the repressive apparatus will be achieved through the struggle of our people. Progress is being made in this direction. The Paraguayan people and our glorious youth are awakening and are becoming aware of the sinister repressive apparatus set up by Stroessner. The people are daily demonstrating to demand that torture be ended in Paraguay.

As Monsignor Ismael Rolon said in his homily at a Sunday morning mass, we must stop fearing. Never again should fear prevail, because fear is the weapon used by torturers to abuse our people.

[Tikhon] Are the opposition parties allowed to function freely? Are they facing obstacles?

[Rivera] No. At present all political parties, except the Communist Party, are functioning legally. There was obviously fraud in the May election. General Rodriguez himself admitted this. He blamed it on lack of political experience. We believe, however, that there was fraud because the election was based on the same voters' list used by the Stroessner regime.

Part 2

PY2406234689 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Second part of interview with Antonio Rivera, member of the Propaganda Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party, by Mikhail Tikhon; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Tikhon] Comrade Antonio Rivera, what chance do you think the Paraguayan Communist Party [PCP] has of getting official recognition and legal status?

[Rivera] The PCP has a historical background in Paraguay because of its 60 years of activity and the fact that its most outstanding members lost their lives in the struggle against the dictatorship. Many organizations and outstanding personalities have spoken in favor of legalizing the PCP. Only now is the suffering and the struggle of the communist leaders coming to light. This is the case of Livio Gonzalez Santander who has told the gloomy story of the Third Precinct Police Station where Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas, and Alfredo Alcorta [communist leaders] have spent more than 20 years. Today this police station is a symbol of what our people have had to struggle against. Every day charges are made, and news agencies and newspapers carry stories about everything that communists and noncommunists—Catholics, peasants, and workers, members of the Liberal Party and the Febrerista Revolutionary Party—have suffered in the torture chambers.

At this time the main thing is that criminals like Pastor Coronel [former investigative police chief]; Lucilo Benitez, also known as Cururu Pire, a sinister torturer; and others currently in jail must be tried. Every time they have to go to court to testify, crowds gather to remind them of their crimes. This is very important because our people are building a historical memory through press reports of the crimes.

The PCP will obtain legal status. It is entitled to participate in the political life of the country because hundreds of communists have lost their lives in the struggle for democracy and freedom in Paraguay.

[Tikhon] What are the PCP's specific proposal for strengthening the democratic process?

[Rivera] We want to improve democracy in our country and expand the international relations of our country which is very isolated. It has spent 35 years being a backwater, a safe haven for murderers, drug traffickers, and internationally sought criminals such as Mengele; Ricord, the famous French drug trafficker; Anastacio Somoza; and other sinister Latin American individuals. All of these people sought shelter in Paraguay, but all that is a thing of the past. Now we have to look to the future, and the specific proposal of the PCP is to strengthen democracy, obtain legal status for our party, and ensure that human rights are respected. Most important of all is to help find a solution to the anxieties of the Paraguayan peasants who are constantly fighting for a piece of land on which to live.

[Tikhon] What are the progressive organizations doing right now to help this come about?

[Rivera] The Catholic Church has done a great deal to help our people, even under the Stroessner regime. No one can deny the historical role of the Catholic Church in the struggle for respect for human rights.

When a march for life and freedom was staged in December 1988 to mark the 40th anniversary of the UN Declaration on Human Rights, priests and believers took to the streets.

Neither can we forget the role that Paraguayan intellectuals and artists have played in our country. They have played a great role. Crowds attended the Ypacarai music festival at which revolutionary songs were sung. This festival was a veritable mass rally against the dictatorship, and Stroessner finally banned it.

Paraguayan artists and intellectuals have always spoken out against the dictatorship and in favor of human rights. The thing is that for many years very little was known about the struggle that our people were waging because the international news media never paid very much attention to our people's struggle. So now people are amazed at what is happening in Paraguay from day to day. What happened in Paraguay this February was not a sudden development. It was part of a long struggle during which hundreds and thousands of young people, peasants, and workers of every profession died.

According to an Amnesty International report, more than 350,000 Paraguayans spent time in jail. So you can see that Stroessner's ouster was not an overnight development. It was not the result of a general's whim. The young Army officers were forced to act by the events, by the sustained struggle of the peasants, the intellectuals, the artists, the church, and even the bourgeoisie, the democratically minded merchants who felt that Stroessner's regime did not offer them the opportunity to develop economically because Stroessner had turned smuggling into a national institution, a source of income, and a way of securing the loyalty of the most reactionary factions of the Army.

[Tikhon] Comrade Rivera, I would like to address an issue in which I have been involved as a journalist for Radio Moscow; namely, the fate of people who were

arrested and are missing. What is being done in Paraguay to find out what happened to people who were arrested and are now missing, people like Comrade Maidana, Miguel Soler, and many other patriots?

[Rivera] Well, the case of Miguel Soler has received a lot of publicity lately. Pastor Coronel is being held responsible for Solor's disappearance. There are witnesses who say that Pastor Coronel killed Miguel Angel Soler. Their testimony carries a lot of weight because they saw Pastor Coronel kicking Soler, causing him to bleed to death, and then leaving him on a street corner. This was reported to the press. Miguel Angel Soler was killed by Pastor Coronel and his myrmidons. Soler's widow has reported this to the press and the courts in Asuncion. One court charge that Pastor Coronel is facing pertains to his involvement in the Soler affair.

The Maidana affair is a similar case only a bit more complicated because Maidana was kidnapped in Argentina. However, the main thing is that our people are demanding clarification of all cases of missing persons: those of Soler, Miadana, and other patriots who are either missing or have been murdered. Right now the foremost goal of our youth and our people is to ensure that the cases will be clarified and the murderers of our people punished. This is the struggle that the PCP is waging. We want the missing persons, not only communists but others as well, found so that they can at least be given a Christian burial.

[Tikhon] Mr Rivera, thank you for answering our questions. We wish the Paraguayan people the best in their struggle for democracy in their country.

[Rivera] I would like to thank Radio Moscow for giving me the opportunity to address its vast audience in Latin America.

Political & Social

PRAVDA Reports 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings

Morning Session Reported

PM2806141189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "First Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued at 1000 on 27 June in the USSR Supreme Soviet hall of sessions in Moscow with USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman M.S. Gorbachev in the chair.

USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov delivered a report on the composition of the USSR Government at a joint sitting of the chambers. (The report is published on page 2).

Deputies G.S. Tarazevich, V.A. Yarin, Yu.T. Komarov, N.S. Sazonov, I.O. Bisher, A.V. Yablokov, V.V. Khmura, Ye. Rakhmadiyev, Yu.T. Akbarov, V.N. Stepanov, V.A. Shekhovtsov, T.N. Chkheidze, S.N. Danilov, and others put questions to the keynote speaker.

Deputy V.I. Matviyenko asked the chairman to urge deputies to confine themselves to putting specific questions in N.I. Ryzhkov's report.

M.S. Gorbachev: I am of a more democratic frame of mind. If a deputy has something on his mind, let him ask the question while the USSR Council of Ministers chairman is here. But the deputies must consider your opinion too.

The USSR Council of Ministers chairman answered numerous questions from deputies. Talking about the possibility of the government's resigning in the event of its being unable to handle the tasks entrusted to it, N.I. Ryzhkov noted that in the future it will be possible to introduce the "vote of confidence" concept. But the government itself, he stressed, must also have the right to resign in connection with the particular situation.

Concerning the problem of the transfer of all power to the soviets, the government head noted that the newly instituted post of USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman for general matters is to act as a link between the Council of Ministers and local soviet bodies.

The discussion focused in particular on questions of improving the structure of the government and national economic management organs. N.I. Ryzhkov pointed out that the reduction in the rate of growth of capital investments, planned for the next 5-year plan, should be a source for replenishing social funds and for the targeted development of particular regions of the country. He confirmed his resolve to defend the creation of the USSR Council of Ministers' permanent organ—the State Commission for Foodstuffs and Purchases—and also advocated the creation, on a democratic basis, of several Construction Materials Ministry-based production concerns.

In connection with personnel matters, the government head expressed the firm intention to defend a number of candidates proposed by him for membership in the Council of Ministers. N.I. Ryzhkov was asked about USSR ministers' pay. He announced that the leaders of ministries and departments currently get R700-800.

M.S. Gorbachev: A good collective farm [kolkhoz] chairman gets R1,200-1,700. At the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium there was a preliminary discussion of how the members of the Supreme Soviet are going to live and work, what basis one is going to act on. It was pointed out that some chairmen of committees, before their new appointments, were receiving twice as much as their proposed pay now. The same goes for some members of the USSR Supreme Soviet. What should be done? The matter is being studied at the moment. For example, the question of party workers' pay. There was much discussion about this, but it turns out that, for example, the secretary of a rural party rayon committee [raykom] now gets paid on a par with the manager of a farm section, but in fact a state farm [sovkhoz] section manager gets an average salary of R700. How do we intend to find the most authoritative and most competent person for the post of raykom secretary?

I do not think, the chairman noted, that there should be any competition here, that we should institute some special extra payment for senior officials. But the question is there and it must be analyzed. So let us agree on this—think about it and then, obviously, a Supreme Soviet law will be required on the subject.

Continuing to answer deputies' questions, N.I. Ryzhkov stressed that on all the remaining vacant posts in the USSR Council of Ministers there would be extensive consultations with deputies, interested enterprises and institutions, and labor collectives.

He went on to say that the 19th party conference decision on the creation of a special state organ on nationalities policy issues and interethnic relations had been implemented. Committees and permanent commissions on these issues have been set up in the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the USSR Council of Ministers all standing organs will tackle them if necessary. The keynote speaker favored the opening of missions for ethnic minorities attached to executive organs, including the USSR Council of Ministers.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question of representation was discussed at the first sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It issued instructions that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government should study the problem.

Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium representing the republics offered their own views and comments on this subject. The question needs to be studied.

Many of the deputies' questions concerned ecological problems. N.I. Ryzhkov talked about the difficulties in selecting a candidate for the post of leader of the USSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment. He agreed to consider the question of placing the department in the charge of deputy government head V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, who is responsible for emergency situations, and announced that there are plans to convert a number of harmful protein and vitamin production facilities and that the ecological program that is being devised will pay special attention to the situation in 104 cities which are the worst from this viewpoint.

In his replies, the Council of Ministers chairman touched on the prospects for the development of the Far East and some other regions of the country, certain sectors of the economy, and the social sphere, and an improvement in the lives of certain population sectors which lack social protection. Emphasis was placed on the need to accelerate the development of self-management and introduce regional economic accountability and self-financing. There was a positive assessment of the proposal to submit major national economic construction projects for broad discussion.

Concerning questions of developing the medical industry and increasing the production of medicines, the government head agreed that ministries and departments have lagged well behind. Another reason for the current situation is the reluctance of many regions to have chemical-pharmaceutical production facilities and develop them on their territory. The results are affecting the situation in our public health system. Emergency measures are being taken to solve the problem.

N.I. Ryzhkov noted that at the present stage the countryside needs patronage assistance, but in economic accountability conditions the government intends to compensate labor collectives for losses associated with it. He talked about projected measures to provide jobs for the population of Central Asian republics.

Talking about the prospects for the use of nuclear test sites, the government head pointed out that the Soviet Union favors a total ban on nuclear explosions and is reducing the number and yield of the tests it carries out. But at the moment the world situation does not allow us to stop improving our armaments completely.

He touched on the question of forming union and republican budgets in regional economic accountability conditions. It was stressed that fundamental changes are needed in the methods to form them. They must not be passed down by the center to the provinces as in the past, but people must start creating them "from below." The government is currently preparing relevant proposals on this matter.

Dwelling on structural changes in the government, N.I. Ryzhkov stressed that at the moment the country cannot afford to eliminate industrial ministries. It would lead to a loss of economic management. But the method of amalgamating them is not a mechanical step. As the socialist market is created, the process of merging departments will increase. This is a product of the economic reform.

The deputies then discussed N.I. Ryzhkov's report.

Deputy G.G. Shtoyk took the floor. He presented his views on the idea of combining two ministries—nonferrous and ferrous metallurgy. As a result, the deputy believes, you get a vast monopoly metal-producing complex which could cause the national economy considerable harm.

Nonferrous metallurgy today, the speaker noted, is a very large and very complex basic sector in our country which has no equal in the world either in terms of production volume or in terms of the list of products. Having described in detail what has been achieved, the speaker dwelt on the problems associated primarily with the enterprises' appreciable effect on the environment.

The deputy argued against the automatic merger of two dissimilar sectors, specifically pointing out that their amalgamation will not produce, as some people assume, an earlier solution of mining and ore dressing problems to a higher technical standard. All it will do will be to create an unwieldy monopoly with fixed assets worth a total of more than R100 billion and an annual commodity output of more than R80 billion, this being blatantly in contradiction with the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies decision on economic competition and the struggle against monopolistic phenomena. It would be simply impossible to manage such an unwieldy bulk.

Attempts have already been made in the country twice in the past—in 1948 and in 1953—to amalgamate these two sectors, the speaker went on. On each occasion the complex that emerged became unmanageable, which ultimately resulted in it being split again. Why repeat past mistakes?

On behalf of deputies working in nonferrous metallurgy, the speaker proposed that the question be looked at not as a matter of amalgamating ministries but as one of creating an independently functioning unified organ for the total production of nonferrous and rare metals. We think, he declared, that it is then that our state will obtain much better returns.

There is no need to apply traditional approaches in order to compose the structure of the Council of Ministers, Deputy A.A. Denisov said. We must take into account the entire context of the state system structure and the conditions in which the work will have to be done, in other words the conditions of restructuring.

The speaker offered his own systems analysis. He emphasized that three basic subsystems can be singled out when structuring any state system: material production, power, and ideology. They have their independent functions which cannot be confused. Our misfortune is that they have been overconfused. The result is that functions either are not performed or are preformed by those who should not be performing them. Conventional thinking has it that all the blame lies with the demoocracy which has taken over everything. The speaker expressed a diametrically opposite point of view: If one were to look deeper into the matter, it would appear that the material production system has completely taken over both power and the party in our country.

In the speaker's opinion, the party should elaborate a concept of restructuring, in other words a modern concept of socialism. This would require abandonment of dogmas and review of conventional ideas. This should be followed by legislative backing of restructuring. The deputy emphasized the importance of separating the functions of legislative and executive power. There must be a separation of the production sphere from the state. The Council of Ministers system should be shaped against the background of precisely such a separation.

The deputy expressed gratification with the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG. He perceived the main success as lying in the fact that we are shifting from a state of confrontation to a state of partnership with a major NATO power.

Deputy R.V. Gudaytis described the Council of Ministers structure in the spheres of culture and public education as conservative, not in line with the sovereignty of the union republics and contradicting the principles of their autonomy. In his opinion, the management of the development of culture should be entirely in the hands of the republics, including the autonomous republics. Today it is impossible to manage culture from the center. We need to revise views on this problem and on the problem of public education. Schools at all levels in the republics and their curricula should conform with national specific features and traditions. Lithuania, for example, is implementing a national concept of enlightenment.

A union committee in the sphere of public education is similar to an agro-industrial complex, and it must be abolished, the deputy believes. In his opinion, this would help to eliminate all deformations in the sphere of culture and education and would promote the development of mutually enriching ties between republics. The money spent on the maintenance of the Ministry of Culture and the Committee for Public Education could be used for the upkeep of children's homes. The solution to the problem lies in the center accepting that a multiplicity of national models of cultures and schools at all levels can actually exist. As for rigid regulations and unification in this regard—they are an anachronism. The deputy emphasized that he was only expressing his personal opinion on this question.

Deputy D.K. Motornyy devoted his speech to questions of developing the country's agrarian sector. He emphasized that an extremely serious situation prevails there. The more we say that it is necessary to adopt measures, he said, the fewer measures are adopted, and locally very little concern is displayed for the agrarian sector. The speaker cited a whole series of examples which have brought nothing but harm to agriculture.

The speaker specifically dwelled on the campaign which was fought between the public and the former Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. The public is triumphant today, he said, the ministry has been abolished. But what is the result? There are tens of thousands of skilled machine operators without work, a green light has been given for the devastation of promising villages, and an end has been put to all irrigated crop farming. Farms will no longer be in a position to properly maintain their land. It may have been done inefficiently, and even very inefficiently, but the ministry did help in solving the main task—the task of enhancing soil fertility. Now it will be necessary to pay twice as much to restore all this. In the speaker's opinion, the Council of Ministers made the decision to abolish this ministry too early.

On the commission's behalf, the deputy supported the candidacy of P.A. Polad-Zade for the office of minister of water resources construction as someone who, in his opinion, is more familiar with land reclamation questions than anyone else and will cope with the assigned work.

Now there is evidently nothing left for us, Deputy V.F. Nikolaychuk from Norilsk said, but to adopt the proposed amendments to the Law on the USSR Council of Ministers. Any other amendments would demand in-depth elaboration and we are not ready for this. Yet the law is not in line with the USSR Constitution. It makes no reference to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or to people's deputies in general, but it does mention the now defunct title of USSR Supreme Soviet deputy.

There has been no change in ministries' functions and, for all intents and purposes, state power remains completely in the government's hands. It remains, just like before, the sole owner and manager of all financial, material, and natural resources. The speaker proposed that the USSR Supreme Soviet adopt a new Law on the USSR Council of Ministers by the end of the year and approve the costs of its maintenance. The preparation of this question, in the speaker's opinion, could be assigned to the Committee for Economic Reform Questions and other Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

The speaker rejected the previously voiced opinion that the fusion of the two metallurgy ministries could result in monopolism. In his opinion, monopolism lies not in the number of departments but in their powers.

The deputy proposed a preliminary and thorough discussion by committees and commissions of all USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees submitted for ratification by the session.

In his speech, Deputy B.Kh. Blayev submitted a number of specific proposals concerning the government's structure. In particular he expressed fear that any fusion of the Ministries of Ferrous and Nonferrous Metallurgy would be detrimental to the interests of the latter department which, in his words, is in danger of "dissolving" in the ferrous metallurgy. Hence the idea which the deputy put forward: creating a USSR State Committee for Metallurgy with the two ministries subordinate to it, provided their apparatus is significantly cut back.

The deputy devoted part of his speech to the problem of priorities in the USSR Supreme Soviet's work. He analyzed mutual relations between suppliers and consumers in our national economy. In the speaker's opinion, the consumer's advantage should not automatically extend to all spheres. He believes that this approach would be specifically incorrect vis-a-vis the national economy's raw material extraction sectors.

Deputy Yu.V. Drunina disagreed with those who consider that an all-Union Ministry of Culture is unnecessary. We are always talking about the importance of culture and about how it provides the foundation on which everything else is built, she said. Properly cultured people, the speaker believes, would not allow problems like, for example, the ecological ones to develop.

The speech touched on the subject of charity. We have become callous and heartless, and this is also associated with the overall decline in cultural standards, the deputy stressed. For a very long time, she went on, we were brought up and taught how terrible it is that the West has charity-run soup kitchens! And yet, look at the number of low-income people in our country! Those who see themselves as cultured people should be in the front ranks of the struggle for our humaneness.

Deputy A.F. Veprev said that the brunt of implementing the tasks of restructuring should be borne by the USSR Council of Ministers. And the actual course of restructuring, in his opinion, depends on our attitude toward the development of the country's agriculture.

The speaker dwelled in detail on questions concerning the production of rape, without which it is impossible to supply the population with either milk or meat. In his view, it is necessary to first and foremost invest in the production of this natural source of protein for animals. The deputy voiced the opinion that the USSR Council of Ministers should give more attention to this question. Lipetsk Oblast has developed sound skills in rape cultivation, and this should be utilized by turning the region into a base for this purpose.

The speaker expressed his views on industry's sponsorship assistance to the countryside, which runs contrary to the economic relations prevailing today. He touched on the topic of the unequal distribution of the workforce between different regions and suggested specific ways to solve the problem.

Deputy Ya.T. Komarov admitted that he is playing the improper role of a ministry's defender and the role of the government's opponent, to which he is not accustomed. From the deputy's point of view, the thesis advocating the closure of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry just for the sake of eliminating a union general construction ministry is not completely substantiated.

The speaker emphasized the importance of a raw material like asbestos for the economy. At present, the country's five asbestos combines supply more than one-half of the world's output. The combines for the production of talc, mica, and graphite are unique enterprises. But they often operate at a loss or their profitability is low, and local soviets find them unnecessary because their output is mainly utilized in other regions and sectors. They may end up being closed down if they are to be handed over to local authorities. The speaker announced the opinion of the plants' directors: The ministry must be retained at this stage. An asbestos association will be created unless this opinion is heeded. The speaker asked deputies to support his opinion: The abolition of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry is premature.

For as long as cotton remains Tajikistan's main crop, there can be no talk at all about any culture in general, Deputy G. Safiyeva declared. Speaking about the multitude of problems arising in the republic due to this single-crop orientation, she emphasized that, according to unwritten laws, the cotton fields are mainly tilled by women. The rights of the region's working people have been violated all these years. They are not paid for climatic conditions coefficient for working in heat of 40 degrees. This question must be solved immediately, at this very session, the deputy believes.

End of 27 Jun Session

PM2906094789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "First Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Speaking about the structure and composition of the USSR Government, M.A. Bocharov stressed that the proposed draft Law on Changes to the USSR Law "On the USSR Council of

Ministers" does not resolve many problems. In particular one is not conscious of a reduction in the supercentralization of the existing apparatus. The clause on changes to the functions of ministries and departments has also been interpreted in a woolly fashion.

The deputy spoke out on two candidacies for ministerial posts—P.A. Polad-Zade and V.G. Gribova—explaining why deputies voted against them at the commission and committee sittings.

A.P. Atadzhanov, a deputy from Uzbekistan, pointed out that the solution of the country's sensitive socioeconomic problems depends on the future of restructuring, on which Soviet people are pinning their most heartfelt hopes. This, he said, compels us to approach our assessment of the proposed government structure and the candidates for leadership posts in a comprehensive fashion.

The speaker, in particular, cast doubts on the advisability of creating a single Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industries.

In his speech deputy F.M. Burlatskiy talked about how individual candidacies were discussed within the framework of the International Affairs Committee. On deputies' instructions, he read out the wishes that were addressed, in particular, to comrades V.M. Kamentsev and K.F. Katushev.

The first is that the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations elaborate a concept for USSR foreign economic relations at the beginning of 1990 and also a structure for and relations between the bodies responsible for their implementation.

Attention was drawn to the need to take urgent steps to overcome the serious shortcomings in this sphere and also to radically increase imports of consumer goods and medicines.

Deputy A.D. Melikov took part in the debate on the future of the USSR Ministry of Culture. Do not deprive us, men of culture, he said, of a Ministry of Culture.

The speaker spoke of this ministry's great role in enriching national cultures, in implementing educational programs, and in the people's spiritual life. It has never prevented the republics from socializing with one another and has not retarded the development of national cultures.

If our country has any complaints to make of the Ministry of Culture, the speaker continued, there are also complaints against other ministries. Restructuring is encompassing them, and there must also be reconstruction within the ministry on the basis of present-day requirements.

Speaking on behalf of the members of the Committee for the Protection of the People's Health, Deputy Yu.I. Borodin dwelt on the candidacy of V.A. Bykov, a contender for the post of USSR minister of the medical and microbiological industry.

The deputy also advocated transferring production of a number of protein compounds to the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, while proposing concentrating production of medical apparatus and medicine in the ministry whose leadership it is proposed to entrust to V.A. Bykov.

Deputy V.Ya. Stadnik expressed concern over the fate of deputies' proposals. He is worried that they are not all being recorded. Moreover, deputies are saying that these proposals were addressed to ministers. Yet the Supreme Soviet is a legislative body. The speaker voiced the opinion that all the proposals should be grouped in the appropriate committees. Thus the committees will be given work and deputies' proposals will not vanish into thin air.

Summing up the results of the debate, M.S. Gorbachev noted, inter alia, that Deputy Stadnik is mistaken in thinking that not all deputies' proposals are being recorded and that any of them are vanishing into thin air. Everything is being recorded. All the questions only have to be distributed in the appropriate direction and handed over to the commissions and committees after they have been recorded. That goes without saying. Problems concerning the government are to be handed to the USSR Council of Ministers.

As for the debate on whether or not to amalgamate ministries, M.S. Gorbachev said, we are allowing the amalgamation of ministries on one condition: This amalgamation must be organically combined without fail with a change in the new ministries' functions. If we simply mechanically amalgamate ministries and leave their functions unchanged, that would miss the point. That would be supercentralization, which would ruin things altogether and create a bureaucratic superstructure that would be unable to function normally.

In discussing this question, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet stressed, we sometimes forget the main point—the decentralization of economic management via the implementation of the provisions enshrined in the Law on the Enterprise and the transition to republiceconomic accountability [khozraschet]. We are proceeding to develop enterprises' economic independence and broaden—considerably, moreover—republics' economic independence. Local soviets must develop their potential by cooperating with enterprises on the basis on the new Law on Self-Management for Local Organs of Power. Thus, ministries with new functions will operate under quite new conditions. That is why their amalgamation is justified.

Today, M.S. Gorbachev continued, we discussed the Ministry of Culture, the development of national cultures, and the flourishing and strengthening of national cultures. I believe that this process must be developed dialectically. We will be unable to ensure the requisite conditions and meet all peoples' interests if we do not provide broad scope for all peoples' development, including linguistic and cultural development, and the preservation and strengthening of national traditions. But a simultaneous process of exchange and mutual cultural enrichment will take place at the same time between all the USSR's nationalities and ethnic groups. This will enrich the culture of every people and the spiritual life of our entire federation.

If we only opt for the one-track path of development, this will lead to national isolation and exclusivity, and any kind of reserve results in every people's opportunities being restricted.

This, M.S. Gorbachev continued, is a dialectical and vital process, and we must use life as a starting point by resolving the question of what management structure there should be in the sphere of culture and what sort of coordination of central and regional functions will be required to promote rapprochement and cultural exchange.

Each people must be supported by all the might and potential at our disposal—both natural, scientfic and technical, and cultural, and so on. This accords with the peoples' interests.

The debate on the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry was also trenchant.

Nikolay Ivanovich, what is your opinion?

N.I. Ryzhkov repeated the thesis from his report that the number of ministries must be reduced. This cannot be done straightaway; it must be approached in a well-considered fashion. At the same time we must not mark time, since we would not then advance economic reform one step.

As for the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the speaker pointed out, I listened attentively to the speeches both at the commissions and at the committees. The proposal to incorporate the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry in the composition of the government may be adopted as an exception.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades are certainly pondering what is to be done....

Deputy V.A. Ivashko took the floor. He voiced the opinion that the retention of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry would contravene the principles vested in restructuring and the line of regional and republic khozraschet. It is well known, he said, that we have already renounced union construction ministries, transferring them to the republics, so why should we now set up a union Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry?

The session rejected the proposal to retain the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry within the structure of the USSR Council of Ministers by a majority vote.

I.A. Andreyeva, N.S. Sazonov, M.G. Rakhimov, N.N. Vorontsov, V.F. Nikolaychuk, S.N. Khadzhiyev, and other deputies, and Minister Ye.I. Chazov, made comments and proposals on the question under discussion.

M.S. Gorbachev submitted a proposal to adopt a law on changes to the USSR Law "On the USSR Council of Ministers" and begin drafting a new Law on the USSR Council of Ministers without delay, taking into consideration the opinions and proposals expressed by people's deputies.

A.I. Lukyanov clarified certain questions relating to the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He dwelt on the proposals voiced by a number of deputies regarding the work procedure of the Supreme Soviet, its chambers, committees, and commissions, and the decisionmaking and voting procedure in the committees and commissions. In this connection it is proposed to make the sequence of work at the Supreme Soviet, the committees, and commissions subject to an agenda.

A.I. Lukyanov announced that the television relay on the chambers' sittings will be transmitted in abridged form. As for the most important sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet, they will be relayed in full, but it is planned to broadcast all these transmissions on the second television channel in the evening in order not to tear people away from their work.

The sitting ended here.

The session will continue its work 28 June.

More on 28 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings

Ryzhkov on Vacant Ecological Chair

LD2806175489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 28 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent A. Tikhomirov, identified by screen caption] In accordance with the [Supreme Soviet's] procedural regulations, the endorsement [of Albalkin's candidature as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers] was switched to the evening session, and in the interval I obtained an interview with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] Well, the whole procedure of selection and the endorsement of cadres is stipulated by the Constitution. Certainly, the chairman of the Council of Ministers makes his own proposals for this or that state post. In this case, as you know, I have proposed certain candidates for state posts, except for one—we did not have a candidate for the State Committee for Nature Protection, and therefore it became vacant rightaway.

Now, six people failed to win a vote of confidence or a recommendation in the committees and commissions, and I removed two people from the list during the course of discussion. That was in the process of discussion in the committees and commissions. The result is that today we shall have nine vacant posts.

How are we to proceed? To go further means that a cycle will also begin. We have to determine new candidatures and submit them again to the Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet will again instruct the appropriate chambers to examine them and, as they say, to go through the process we have already gone through in this period.

[Unidentified questioner] You said four people had rejected the post of chairman of the State Committee for Nature Protection.

[Ryzhkov] That is right, four.

[Same questioner] Why, for what reasons?

[Ryzhkov] You want me to be frank?

[Questioner] Yes! [laughter]

[Ryzhkov] It is easier to criticize than to work. Work must be done there, decisions must be taken. But let us assume that if one occupies a certain academic position one can always, of course, express one's point of view. In this instance, everyone realizes that this is a very responsible committee and the most enormous tasks have been entrusted to it, bearing in mind that there is a complex ecological situation in the country, and they are perfectly well aware of it. Therefore, I think they felt that life here would not at all be a bed of roses! [end recording] [video shows Ryzhkov surrounded by journalists, sound recordists, etc]

Abalkin Endorsed as Deputy Chairman

LD2806171889 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: "This was a major and serious study". These words sounded in the hall today after members of the Soviet parliament heard the speech of Academician Leonid Abalkin and his answers to deputies' questions.

The director of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of the Economy, who was recommended to the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and to head a state commission on the economic reform, which is being formed, laid down his concept of overhauling the Soviet economy.

Describing its present state as critical, the academician noted that the economic situation is worsening month after month. The gap between the state's revenue and its spending amounts to 100 billion roubles, inflation is surging, the deficit is growing. In these conditions, the government should receive from parliament the right to carry through drastic measures, Abalkin said.

Speaking about economic reform as the principal way of an economic recovery, Abalkin stressed that the reform should not be different in industry and in agriculture as was the case until now. The essence of revamping economic life is in abolishing administrative pressure, he said. "If there is no money, give autonomy". The scientist sees in this formula the pledge of future successes.

Academician Abalkin links hopes for an improvement in the economic situation to the development of the socialist market and the introduction of regional profit-and-loss accounting. Given a very determined work, efforts to form such a market will succeed in six to seven years. Approximately by this time or somewhat later, a transition can be made to the rouble's full convertibility, the scientist believes.

As for regional cost-accounting models, they cannot, according to Abalkin, be absolutely common in various union republics which drastically differ in the structure of the economy, traditions, etc. However, the fundamental principles of economic autonomy should be uniform for all.

The candidate to the post of vice premier urged parliament to draw the most serious attention to the problem of unemployment. It exists even now in Central Asia and some other regions were high population growth outstrips the development of the infrastructure.

Twelve to fifteen million people will be laid off as a result of the economic reform by the end of the century, according to Abalkin's estimates. This means that a serious state programme for re-training, occupational counseling and other social measures is needed. The scientist predicts that a multitude of the forms of ownership will likewise free up worker hands.

Abalkin looks with restraint at proposals to increase the USSR's foreign debt to handle current economic problems. He alluded to the negative experience of some east European countries which had already trodden this path.

Responding to the question of whether aid to other countries (?would) be reduced, especially with currency, the academician said that the size of this aid is relatively small. The all-important thing is that international obligations should be sacredly fulfilled, he stressed.

The scientist used harsh terms in describing the lax technological and production discipline at many of the country's factories. When a note, which came from the hall, deplored that people work a lot but live poorly, the academician answered sternly: "We live not worse than we work".

The conviction with which the scientist set out his position, promising not easy years ahead, predetermined the results of the voting. The absolute majority of deputies voted to endorse Abalkin as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Ten deputies out of 500 who took part in the voting were against and 11 abstained.

Belousov's Candidacy Discussed

LD2806165689 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 28 Jun 89

[TASS parliamentary correspondent report from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—At the joint evening meeting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the deputies heard with special attention the account of Igor Belousov, candidate to the post of a deputy head of the government. And this is easy to understand for never before has the leader of the State Commission for Military-Industrial Affairs addressed parliamentarians.

The members of the Supreme Soviet received the notion about the scale of the Soviet defence industry. Belousov who dealt with the problems of this industry in the previous composition of the government said that the output of the defence industry makes up just over eight per cent of gross national product. At first glance this seems to be more than the share of the war industry in gross national product of the USA. But it should be taken into account that gross national product of the USSR is several times smaller than that of the USA, Belousov explained. So the actual expenditures on the production of military equipment of the USSR are considerably smaller.

Belousov noted that the openness of Soviet society spread to such a specific area as the defence industry. As an [words indistinct] mentioned the fact that up to 53 Soviet military aircraft were demonstrated at the recent air show in Paris.

Belousov is of the opinion that the situation which developed as a result of the Soviet Union's adoption of the new defensive doctrine should be fully used. The defence branches of the industry are to increase considerably the output of civilian goods, whose share will make up 60 per cent of their total output by the year 1995. The ten priority directions on which plants of the Defence Industry will be working have been determined. They include the manufacture of equipment to process agricultural produce, manufacture of consumer goods, medical equipment, electronics, computers, means of communication.

Speaking during the discussion of Belousov's candidature, Vladimir Lapygin, chairman of the parliamentary committee for defence and state security, emphasized that for the first time there is an organ in the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet whose task is to control the activity of the defence industry. The very fact of its creation refutes the assertions made during the debate that there is, allegedly, absolutely no control over the activity of the Soviet military-industrial complex. He said that Belousov's candidature has been unanimously endorsed by the committee.

Several other deputies spoke in the candidate's support. By the majority vote Belousov has been endorsed as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Belousov Addresses Session

LD2806215189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1833 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Remarks by Igor Belousov, head of the State Commission for Military-Industrial Affairs, at the evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 28 June at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrades, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, allow me for 3 or 4 minutes to set out the program as I see it, and which it will be necessary to implement if you entrust me.

First, I consider us obliged to make full use of the unique situation is connected with the new defense doctrine now connected with the sharp reduction in the level of military equipment and weapons and which is a consequence of the new political thinking. In this connection, I consider it essential to tackle the following questions:

First, taking account of the considerable reduction in funds and allocations for armaments and military equipment, it is necessary, nonetheless, to ensure the highest standard of the equipment which must be created for our army. I am convinced that in order to resolve these issues there are many tested ways as well as new ways. I shall say only that together with the need to support our scientists from the point of view of the development of the experimental base, it is also necessary to introduce new directions in this work and improve links with the USSR Academy of Sciences, competition in examining and developing projects, real support for revolutionary new decisions in equipment, and finally, democratism in contacts and work with the chief designers.

Second, I consider it essential to fully ensure the level of quantitative supplies of equipment and armaments which will be affirmed for the defense complex. I consider that in this, balance should be fully ensured in the program which it will be necessary to implement. I consider that special attention should be paid to improving the reliability and quality of military equipment.

Third, I consider it essential in this period of time, at the end of this 5-year plan period and in the next one, that particular attention should be paid to the actual transfer of the scientific-technical achievements which there will be in the defense sectors of industry—their transfer to all other sectors of the national economy. This can produce a vast economic effect.

Fourth, I consider it an extremely important task to actually implement the principles and decisions on the partial conversion of military production, and the questions of conversion should be resolved bearing in mind the following: first, on the well-thought-out basis of an all-round discussion of this question, to make no mistakes in the range of military equipment that will be produced for our Soviet Army. Second, to the maximum extent and fully, to make use of the freed capacities for the interests of the national economy. Third, to not permit any tension in social questions at enterprises where the partial conversion of military production will take place. The next and fourth question is connected with the fact that in that period of time it is necessary to change from a level of military equipment for the military sectors of industry of 60 percent, as from today, and 40 percent for the national economy, to a level by 1995 of 60 percent for the national economy and 40 percent of military equipment.

Fifth, to ensure the resolution of many—chiefly the first ten—troubled areas in the national economy on the basis of the achievements of the defense complex and taking account of conversion. These ten troubled areas are the following: first, equipment for the processing of agricultural produce for the agroindustrial complex; second, equipment for light industry; third, equipment for trade and catering; fourth, consumer goods; fifth, electronics; sixth, computer equipment; seventh, medical equipment; eighth, communications equipment; ninth, civil aviation; tenth, sea transportation and fisheries.

Finally, the next question is connected with the fact that I consider it essential to lay particular stress on the first of these ten areas—that is, equipment for the agroindustrial complex, bearing in mind the fact that is evident today that one-third of the output produced by our agriculture is irretreivably lost, mainly because of the absence of processing equipment. I consider the approach we proclaimed earlier connected with giving aid to agriculture to be incorrect. I consider that in these conditions this is too weak an assessment. In my opinion, one should speak of the obligation of the defense complex with regard to the agroindustrial complex, with regard to agriculture. I consider that all questions connected with the processing sectors can be resolved by the defense complex in a very short period. The necessary capacities and possibilities for this exist.

And finally, one more question. I consider it essential to support in every way, at every stage of their work, and at all levels of discussion the development of electronics and computer equipment because, for the national economy as a whole, the state of electronics and computer equipment that exists today will not allow a sharp increase in the efficiency of the national economy and ensure the development of the national economy at the necessary rate.

And finally, two general parameters. The first general parameter from my point of view is that despite the fact that the defense complex has its own specific features, its own very serious features, the introduction of the new economic reform, the search for new economic levers in the defense complex should be characteristic just as unambiguously for the defense complex as for the whole national economy.

And finally the second general parameter is, from my point of view, that particular attention should be paid in the defense complex to resolving and developing social questions, large, medium, and small, which have been spoken of here today, because only the resolution of social questions can ensure the resolution of issues connected with quality, connected with labor productivity, connected with people's moods, connected with their work.

It is in these issues that I intend to work if you entrust me with fulfilling this program. [applause] [passage omitted]

Lapygin on Defense Committee

LD2806213289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1923 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Remarks by Deputy Vladimir Lapygin, member of the committee for defense and state security, at the evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet 28 June at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, I would like to dwell for just a couple of minutes on the following: It has been alleged before the Supreme Soviet by someone—it is well-known by whom—that the committee for the issues of defense and state security represents a certain military and industrial complex, so to speak, which, as a matter of fact, must not be entrusted with this area. Concerning this issue, I must say that considering the composition of our commitee, the following must be said: Military ranks account for 20 percent—these are straight military with ranks; science and all public scientific institutions that have representatives in this committee account for 12.5 percent; workers account for 15 percent; directors account for 30 percent; and party, trade union, and social workers account for 22.5 percent. Even if I am regarded as belonging to the military and industrial complex—and

incidentally, I, as designer general and director, deal, or our enterprise deals, in two-thirds of its work with space programs, the development of control systems for carrier rockets and spacecraft, so we are part of the scientific complex—even in this case all our so-called military and industrial complex accounts for 32.5 percent in this committee. You see that the majority of comrades who are members of this committee are in no way linked to military production. This is how I would put it.

Is this good or bad? On the one hand, from the point of view of criticism of the military and industrial complex, this is not bad, I think, and everything is sensible here. On the other hand, from the business point of view, I think this creates a certain difficulty in our committee's work. I mean, the tasks are great, the issues are very important starting from the strategy of arming and providing for defense to state security—you see what I mean—and to producing and manufacturing this equipment. In other words, there must be specialists there.

Government Leaders Grant Interviews to Media

Kryuchkov Interviewed on Security

LD2806190689 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Radio Moscow correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov has requested the chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, Vladimir Kryuchkov, to answer some questions for Radio Moscow. The fact that the chairman of the USSR State Security Committee is being interviewed for the foreign service of Radio Moscow is an example of progress achieved by democratization and openness in this country. Could you say a few words about the role and place of the USSR State Security Committee in the current stage of Soviet society's development?

I would like to point out, Vladimir Kryuchkov said, that the state security bodies are an inalienable and organic part of Soviet society. The laws governing Soviet society fully pertain to the state security bodies, aimed at creating normal conditions for the life of Soviet people. In fact, the State Security Committee has both internal and external functions. But the major guideline and principle is legality. There've been no perfect laws in the world. Indeed, laws can be more or less perfect, but we must observe them despite their degree of perfection. Another thing I would like to point out, Vladimir Kryuchkov went on to say, is the fact that we have high standards for our staff members who are to be morally pure, honest, dutiful, and faithful. We both demand and cultivate these qualities among our staff. I believe the processes of restructuring and openness taking place in this country fully pertain to the state security bodies. Indeed, the State Security Committee has been carrying out a comprehensive restructuring, too. I think this is shown by those publications which depict our work. For one, the State Security Committee made public some of its operations, said the chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, Vladimir Kryuchkov.

In his speech at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, pointed out that the State Security Committee should make a great contribution to the struggle against organized crime in this country. Did Nikolay Ryzhkov have mafia in mind?

I do not think that there is mafia in the Soviet Union in the traditional definition of the word, said Vladimir Kryuchkov. But if we don't get action on the problem, the consequences may become too difficult to cope with. Mafia is not the word. Organized crime and mafia are different things. This view is shared by other experts as well. Above all, mafia is an organization; mafia is a state within a state. Fortunately, things have not yet gone so far in this country, said Vladimir Kryuchkov.

What about the recent events in Fergana, Uzbekistan, when crowds of people were destroying houses of the Meskhetian Turks and beating police officers? Doesn't all this look like consequences of Mafia activity? Answering this question, Vladimir Kryuchkov said: There are different reasons behind the events in Fergana. The events were triggered off by the tension in interethnic relations and the social sphere. Of course, to a certain degree they were due to the fact that criminals had a free hand. It is really outrageous when one man kills another man only because he belongs to a different ethnic group. Some time ago we felt indignant reading about such developments in the capitalist countries. But today we have similar problems in this country. Force is not the only way to cope with this problem. There is a whole range of other means and methods. When asked whether he was planning to meet the United States Central Intelligence Agency leaders, Vladimir Kryuchkov said this:

We have already had first contacts. We should have more contact on cooperation on some issues—for one, the issue of fighting terrorism. One wing of terrorism is against the United States, and the other one against the Soviet Union. We are all interested in overcoming this most dreadful phenomenon of this century. If we take most decisive measures we shall do away with this evil rather quickly. Some remains of terrorism may be left over but they will be remains and not terrorism itself, said the chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, Vladimir Kryuchkov. [passage omitted]

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Proceedings

LD2806202589 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1500 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent (Irina Chaykova); date, place of interview not given—recorded; questions in Slovak, Ryzhkov answers in Russian fading to Slovak translation; first three paragraphs are announcer's introduction]

[Text] [Announcer] Letters and telephone calls from various countries—above all, from socialist countries—show that our listeners continue to follow with great

attention the development of political events in the Soviet Union, including the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At the same time, nearly every letter or telephone call contains a specific question addressed to people's deputies of the USSR or to members of the Soviet Government. They cover a considerably wide range of problems.

Our correspondent (Irina Chaykova) has recorded an interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet Premier. Listen to the interview now:

[Begin recording] [(Chaykova)] Nikolay Ivanovich, excuse this question, but are you not surprised by the fact that the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet are so stormy, as the deputies are examining with great attention all the businesslike or simply human features of the candidates for government posts?

[Ryzhkov] I, personally, am not suprised. One had to expect this because in our country there is at present a high political activity of the people. We felt this before the elections of people's deputies of the Soviet Union, during the elections, and after them too. Indeed, there is great political tension in the country. There are very many problems; thus that which is taking place and the way in which it is taking place is only normal. I think that it would not be natural if everything outside the Kremlin wall should be boiling and inside there should he holy calm.

[(Chaykova)] No doubt, but we have heard that far from all the candidates for government posts have been recommended and approved by individual deputies' committees and comissions. This is, above all, true about candidates for the post of USSR minister of culture and chairman of the Committee for Sport. The people's deputies sharply criticized their activity. It is not only those who were unsuccessful in the preliminary interviews in the Supreme Soviet who are complaining about their fate.

[Ryzhkov] What does complain mean? It is possible to cry for days and nights during criticism, but this is normal.

[(Chaykova)] You remember, naturally, that at the Congress of People's Deputies many speakers said that there are too many ministries of various kinds. It seems that we hold a world record in this respect. Now, although it is true that a process of reducing the number of ministries is in progress, according to many people it is happening too slowly and with difficulties. What is your view on this question?

[Ryzhkov] I do not think it is a simple matter to liquidate ministries. It is necessary to approach this issue responsibly. When one only counts the number of ministries—well, this is not an economic nor an organizational approach. Depending on how conditions are created in the basic link, that is, in enterprises—when a great economic independence is achieved there in reality—then we shall liquidate branch ministries. But this is a continuing process. Besides this there are ministries that exist in all countries—national defense, finance, and so on for example. It would be very silly to liquidate them; they will stay.

[(Chaykova)] Some people believe that radical economic reform should be carried out immediately and that you should not wait for this 5-year plan to end. What is your view?

[Ryzhkov] There is 1 year of the 5-year plan left. You must understand that all economic norms for enterprises have been approved and all their plans have been based on them. We have lived for 4 years in harmony with those plans and have been taking them into account in our activity. If we should, in the fifth year, cancel everything, break everything, then I do not know what would happen. In my opinion this would cause more harm then good. It is necessary to finish this 5-year plan. But this does not mean, however, that we are not at present preparing for new things. Some new elements will be tested in 1990, but the radical reform in its full extent will start in the new 5-year plan.

[(Chaykova)] And finally, the last questions. How do you view the idea of territorial and regional financial autonomy? In some Baltic republics it will be introduced from 1 January next year. Did not the representatives of Soviet Baltic republics take part in the working out of the trend as a whole?

[Ryzhkov] You know, on the issue of territorial financial autonomy we agreed on many points. Besides this, you no doubt know that we have worked out general trends and plans together with them, the Baltic region. We have been working out things with them, drafting plans and laws to be discussed—and now? To a certain extent our Baltic colleagues have diverted from these basic directions. It is necessary to carefully study their views. I think that they have healthy ideas, but it is necessary to think again about some things. There are also proposals about which I have great doubts. Let us consider, for example, the question about one's own currency. There are still many unclear points on this, in my opinion. What does it mean? Will there be two currencies, possibly? I do not know how to do this; and is it really necessary? Just look: At the meeting of EEC representatives in Spain the question of a common currency for the whole of western Europe was discussed. This, as I understand it, will happen sometime in the future, but still one can see a trend toward it, nevertheless. And in our country should the trend be developing in the

opposite direction—from a common currency to a number of currencies in various republics? We must think about the future, take into account all the circumstances, all the details. The main thing is not to do silly things. I shall repeat again: We need prudence in such serious matters. [end recording]

29 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Government Post Debates Resume

LD2906063489 Moscow TASS in English 0629 GMT 29 Jun 89

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—The new Soviet full-time parliament resumed the discussion of the government's proposed make-up this morning at a meeting chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The debate opened yesterday after preliminary hearings in parliamentary committees and commissions, in which the vast majority of candidates suggested by Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov had been endorsed. The six rejected nominees will be replaced by others.

During a full day of deliberations yesterday the parliament was only able to confirm four members of the new Council of Ministers.

They are First Deputy Premiers Lev Voronin, who will deal with general matters, and Yuriy Maslyukov, who will be in charge of the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] agency, and Deputy Premiers Leonid Abalkin, who will oversee economic reform, and Igor Belousov, who will take over the military-industrial complex.

Eight more deputy premiers are to be confirmed and the morning session is discussing the nominees.

Biryukova Considered, Approved

LD2906105189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 29 Jun 89

["Our commentator" Aleksandr Ruvinskiy report on the 29 June morning joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] At 1000 today the session resumed. The joint session of the chambers continued with discussion of the personal composition of the Soviet Government. At the beginning of the session, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is in the chair, expressed his judgement of the procedure of debate of the candidatures. In fact, the debates are often prolonged. Questions to candidates are repeated. The chairman of the session proposed that at the beginning of the debate, the chairmen of the committees at which the candidature had been discussed, should be given a hearing, and then the pretenders to the post should answer deputies' questions, with the time for replies being limited.

Deputies examined the candidature of Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova to the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Comrade Biryukova spent an hour answering the most varied questions. Here are some:

Deputies were interested in knowing when the Pensions Law would be adopted and how its drafting is progressing. The question of establishing small enterprises in rural areas, which would help solve many social problems, was raised. Prices of children's goods were discussed, as was aid to large families. The need to set up clinics like those organized by doctors (Elizarov) and (Kasyan) throughout the country was urged. Questions were raised about allocations to physical culture and sport, equipping schools, and the role of trade unions in the life of our society. A question about the differences in the care of patients in treatment establishments of the departmental and the general type was raised. Even the question of whether Aleksandra Pavlovna smoked was asked. I can tell you the answer was in the negative.

A considerable number of deputies spoke during the discussion of the candidature, and all were in favor of electing Aleksandra Pavlovna to the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Bureau for Social Development, Consumer Goods and Services. But they also made a number of requests of Aleksandra Pavlovna. Deputy Semukha—he is chairman of the Belorussian Red Cross Society—considers it necessary to give more attention to the output of diagnostic medical facilities, and to improve care for the disabled. This was also mentioned by Deputy Neumyvakin, chairman of the board of the All-Russian Society for the Blind. Deputies advocated releasing women from working night shift. This was also one of the wishes of the candidate.

The question of the candidature was put to the vote, and Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova was confirmed in the post of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers by a majority of votes.

At the end of the session many deputies again returned to procedural questions. They put forward proposals about how best to organize future discussions of candidatures. Attention was also drawn to the fact that at the session a considerable number of deputies were absent—several dozen. Their absence was connected with the work of the republican sessions, and with fulfillment of deputies' local duties, but deputies consider it necessary to register them in such cases in the presidium, as the absence of deputies could create difficulties during the voting.

One deputy—a physician by special training, who did not give her name—proposed that deputies be given opportunities for physical culture and health activities in their spare time, after sessions. Deputies supported the proposal.

Several minutes ago, after a break, the session resumed work. It is now being chaired by Comrade Lukyanov. The question of the candidature of Vladimir Kuzmich Gusev to the post of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers in charge of the chemical and timber complex has been put to the debate. We will inform you of the results of this debate.

Candidacy Debate Length Limited

LD2906092289 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 29 Jun 89

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—The experience of Wednesday when the Supreme Soviet was only able to confirm four out of some 70 nominees for government positions made the new sitting parliament brood over how many more days it will take it to complete confirmation procedures.

This is why this morning's session started with the question of how much time shall be alloted for debate on every candidate. A total of 217 Supreme Soviet deputies voted for 30 minutes and another 216 for an hour.

Each half of the legislature continued to insist on its option until Moscow's Boris Yeltsin made a compromise suggestion of 45 minutes which satisfied everyone.

The only member of the "fair sex" to be nominated for the Council of Ministers, Aleksandra Biryukova, was the first to face parliament. She was suggested for a deputy premier and head of the government's Bureau for Social Development.

An energetic and active woman who is a committed advocate of the healthy way of life, Biryukova looks much younger than her age (she turned 60 early this year) and could serve as a living reproach to some of the men speaking from the same parliamentary rostrum before.

She gave confident, substantiated and very competent answers to questions from the floor, most of which concerned social affairs.

Biryukova called for a comprehensive programme for improving the position of women, paying special attention to the fact that some three million Soviet women have to work night shifts at present. She said that it is essential to draw more men into light industry, first of all the textile sector, and reminded deputies that way back in the 1930s there were more men employed in the spinning and weaving industries in the USSR than women.

Biryukova told parliament about the preparation of a new pension law which will apparently be submitted to law-makers for a first reading this year and which will make the size of pensions dependent on the length of service and the quality of work.

Many questions were about specific problems like retail trade outlets in the countryside, the employment situation in Central Asia and the state of affairs with disposable syringes.

There was laughter in the hall when the following message from a Transcaucasian deputy was read out: "When the only woman in the government is confronted with so many questions, my heart of a man from the Caucasus just can't stand it. Let's vote."

In the vote, Biryukova was confirmed in her post by a majority of deputies.

Gusev Elected Deputy Chairman

LD2906110189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 29 June broadcasts a 10-minute report by correspondent Marina Novitskaya from the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow, which notes that this morning's session discussed Gusev's candidacy for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Novitskaya talks about the importance of the position, which deals with the chemical and timber complex, and then gives the results of the voting, which came after some strong questioning of Gusev. The voting is as follows: 35 deputies voted against Gusev, but the majority voted in favor of Gusev taking up the post.

Novitskaya notes that the deputies are now having a break from discussions and that at 1600 [1200 GMT] the meetings of commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet will commence.

Debate on Defense Committee Analyzed

PM2906093089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Losarev report from the Kremlin: "Parliament Continues Its Work"]

[Text] Observing the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, listening to the deputies' speeches, and talking with them in the corridors, you cannot help concluding that the session has retained the heatedness, seriousness, principledness, and trenchancy in discussing problems of vital importance to the country that characterized the Congress of People's Deputies. The opinion that was current until recently among certain groups of deputies that the Congress had formed an "obedient" Supreme Soviet blew away like smoke from the very first minute of the session's work. This was confirmed by yesterday's joint session of the Supreme Soviet chambers, at which the deputies' attention was on the report of N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the subsequent keen debate on the structure and composition of the country's government and problems relating to the functioning of various ministries and departments. The majority of deputies gave a profound, critical

analysis of the activity of the country's former government and put forward constructive proposals aimed at forming a new mechanism, appropriate to the tasks of restructuring, for the activity of the newly formed ministries, committees, and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

And at the moment there are plenty of problems here. This was demonstrated by the course of the discussion of the composition of committees and commissions at sittings of the Soviet of Nationalities and Soviet of the Union the day before. The keenest debate arose in the course of the discussion of the composition of the Committee for Defense and State Security Qeustions. N. Neyland, deputy from Latvia, started it with his speech. On behalf of "my compatriots," the deputy expressed surprise that the committee includes A. Klautsen—first secretary of Riga Latvian Communist Party City Committee [gorkom]. In the speaker's view, his place on the committee should be taken by I. Kezbers, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, on the grounds that he is "a very competent man who touched on defense questions in his election program, has worked as a diplomat, and has studied military-political problems." But the following speakers, A. Shamikhin and A. Rubiks, also, incidentally, from Latvia, proved convincingly that this proposal is by no means beyond dispute. The arguments in favor of A. Klautsen cited by the deputies are hardly sufficiently convincing, either: the fact that the headquarters of the Baltic Military and Border Districts and military academies are located in Riga. The debate, in which other deputies from Latvia became involved, was resolved by V. Lapygin, chairman of the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, who proposed that the new candidacy be taken into account on a future occasion, at the time of rotation of the committee members.

Deputies from Kazakhstan also tried to insist on the inclusion of their own representative on the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions—Ye. Auyelbekov, first secretary of Kzyl-Orda Kazakh Communist Party Oblast Committee [obkom], spoke on this question at the Soviet of Nationalities sitting.

The atmosphere in the auditorium became heated after the speech by E. Bichkauskas, deputy from Vilnius, who stated that the refusal to include a Lithuanian representative on the committee amounts, in his view, to a "lack of confidence in the republic and an infringement of its rights." Deputy V. Antanaytis, chief of a faculty at the Lithuanian Agriculture Academy, spoke out still more emphatically on this score. We see this, he stated, as either discrimination or distrust, distrust of the "Sajudis" people's front, because nearly all the Lithuanian deputies are members of it.

What problems, in the opinion of the deputies from Lithuania, should be resolved by their representative on the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions? I quote E. Bichkauskas' speech: "There is the demand for the withdrawal of troops from Lithuanian territory, the demilitarization of Lithuania, the opportunity for Lithuanian citizens to carry out military service on the territory of their own republic, and other matters." As you can see, these are not new issues. They were raised by Lithuanian representatives at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and were by no means supported in every respect. There were repeated appeals in the course of the Congress and of the session that the lofty platform should not be used for rally declarations and for defending personal ambitions and parochial interests, but unfortunately not everyone heeded them.

Deputies who are representatives of the Armed Forces also participated actively in the discussion of the composition of the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions. They said that the main principles in forming the committee should be the competence of the members, the voluntary principle, the composition (50 percent members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and 50 percent deputies who are not on the Supreme Soviet), and the inclusion of representatives of all the republics on the committee. But in the event not all these principles were taken into account.

The proposal of USSR Supreme Soviet member V. Volkov, secretary of the party committee at the Sverdlovsk M.I. Kalinin Machine Buidling Plant, to include on the committee the junior officers who are represented at the Congress met with the deputies' approval. These officers, the deputy believed, have opinions of their own, can assess the standard of military equipment objectively and knowledgeably, and will undoubtedly be useful in the committee's work. And once again, for the umpteenth time, the lists were refined, opinions were heard, and proposals were put to the vote. There was a trenchant, emotional speech from Colonel A. Tsalko on the need for strict monitoring of the appropriation, distribution, and expenditure of funds for defense and the placing of leadership cadres in defense spheres, and on the low level of social protection for servicemen. In particular, the deputy cited an example of what is, in his view, the extravagant use of aviation equipment.

After a detailed discussion, the composition of the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions was confirmed. Deputy Volkov's proposal was adopted in part—Senior Lieutenant N. Tutov became a member of the committee. But the candidacy of Colonel A. Tsalko, who proposed himself for the committee, was not passed. Other subdivisions of the parliament—committees and commissions—were also confirmed. But the debates on problems associated with their work continued at the joint sitting of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Tuesday. In an atmosphere of strict exactingness, the deputies discussed questions of the country's emergence from the economic and financial crisis, the further development of the agrarian complex, and problems associated with reducing the number of ministries. The uncompromising and principled way in which these questions were raised is shown by, for

instance, the speech by V. Opolinskiy, deputy from the trade unions. He reproached the Council of Ministers chairman for having said nothing in his report about how the country's social budget is formed and what the union republics' share of it is. The impression is, he said, addressing Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, that you do not want the deputies to know about this. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers described in detail the methodology used in forming the union budget, acknowledging that with the transition of the union republics to economic accountability it must change radically. Other questions were also examined in detail.

The parliament continued its work on 28 June. Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed and confirmed the composition of the country's government.

Lapygin Explains Security Committee's Role

PM2906090389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with V.L. Lapygin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, by S. Taranov under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet": "Glasnost and State Security"; date and place of interview not specified—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Vladimir Lavrentyevich Lapygin, chief designer of the Moscow automation and instrument-building science-and-production association, has been elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions. He is 64 years old. During the war he worked as an apprentice and later as fitter at an aviation plant. In 1952 he graduated from the Moscow Aviation Institute. He is a specialist in ICBM guidance systems and space technology (one of his latest jobs was the the "Buran" on-board guidance system). He is a professor and doctor of technical sciences, Hero of Socialist Labor, and winner of the Lenin and State Prizes.

[Taranov] What do you see as the new committee's tasks?

[Lapygin] There has never been an organ of this kind in the entire history of Soviet power. In general terms, the committee's objective can be formulated as follows: reliably ensuring the country's reasonable defense capability and security at optimum expenditure. Every defense building decision and program must be based on the principles of the new political thinking and—equally importantly—must bear in mind the real economic difficulties experienced by the people.

The times of ruthless squandering and departmental "infallibility" are gone. I hope that the consideration of alternative options to specific decisions and the involvement of experts and specialists who view problems from unorthodox angles will become the rule in the work of the committee.

[Taranov] The committee is made up of 33 people. Seven are military men, 19 represent defense industry enterprises, 2 are from the KGB, and 5 are party oblast committee secretaries... Does this not mean that people "with a vested interest" will be monitoring themselves?

[Lapygin] This question was also raised at the Supreme Soviet session. I side with Ye. Primakov, who replied that when the Committee on Agrarian Questions was formed no one had any misgivings about the fact that most of its members were agriculture specialists. Why should we rely on amateurs in defense matters? After all, defense matters are a very specialized sphere. It takes years to fathom the range of its problems and characteristic features. Meanwhile specific decisions have to be made right now or in the near future rather than at an indeterminate point in the distant future.

Now about the candidacies. If you take a closer look you will see that the Committee is by no means uniform. There is a writer—the well-known Vasil Bykov; two Academicians—Ye. Velikhov and A. Gaponov-Grekhov; and workers, for instance radio equipment setter S. Golovin, cutter V. Lukin, team leaders V. Opolinskiy and Ye. Nemtsev; and representatives of trade unions and public organizations. Our oldest colleague is 66 year old Vello Iosifovich Vare, elected from the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans, a scientific staffer of the Estonian Academy of Sciences History Institute. There is a deputy from the Lenin Communist Youth League —34-year-old Sergey Tsyplyayev, who works as academic secretary at the Leningrad Optical Institute...

[Taranov] For many years any attempt at outside intervention in the affairs of the Ministry of Defense and the KGB was rejected on the pretext of the need to preserve state secrets. Now yesterday's secrets are receding into the past, but as far as I know, the sessions of the new committee will take place without the participation of the press and the public. Is this in keeping with the spirit of glasnost?

[Lapygin] There are fewer secrets now, but some remain. They relate primarily to the creation of new types of arms and to technological priorities in their development and production.

Whether we like it or not, we are forced to compete with other countries. People in the United States know, of course, that we are developing systems which are capable in principle of countering their SDI. However, that does not mean that we have to furnish them with detailed accounts of what we have achieved in specific areas of research and specific developments.

Military secrets can at the same time be commercial secrets. It is economically most advantageous to make use of technologies which have been developed if not yet assimilated by a rival. Some of them can cost hundreds

of millions, even billions of rubles or dollars and can seriously affect the might of a country as a whole. They simply have to be kept under "lock and key."

Incidentally, there also remains unjustified secrecy. Is the location of the General Staff perhaps a secret just because there is no nameplate outside? And what is secret about the location of major military enterprises and bases which the whole world knows about? It is necessary now once and for all to rid ourselves of primitive spy mania. It is worse still when an attempt is made to hide all kinds of problems and shortcomings under the mantle of secrecy, such as army crime rate statistics or complex problems in the daily life of the officer corps.

Pseudosecrecy hampers the introduction of useful ideas in the civilian economy. There is a whole treasure trove of untapped potential here. But I must stress that the state secret problem is a complex one. A categorical approach and excessive emotionalism will do it poor service.

[Taranov] Many questions about the activities of the KGB have accumulated in society, engendered largedly by a dearth of information and the complex history of this department. What is the correlation between the KGB's work and functions and the democratization of society?

[Lapygin] The work of the KGB must be subject to the law and nothing else. It is up to the people's deputies and the Supreme Soviet to pass laws which do not infringe upon the rights of the individual. An example of this is the anullment of the footnote to Article 11.

Incidentally, many claims against the KGB are unfounded and stem from ignorance of the real state of affairs.

Take for instance the events in the Fergana valley and a number of other interethnic conflicts and extremist actions. It is worth asking: If the fires and pogroms in Uzbekistan were planned in advance, what was the KGB doing? Or was it perhaps that the opinion of the KGB was not heeded?..

[Taranov] One of the tasks of your Committee is to monitor the work of the KGB and the Armed Forces. What form will this take?

[Lapygin] We will listen to heads of departments and their deputies. It is necessary also to set up a system of extradepartmental experts and make use of information provided by the public, the press, and the population. It is true that an efficient monitoring mechanism has not yet been devised. Whatever the case, it must have a legal basis.

There is also a need for oversight of the KGB on the part of organs of soviet power and on the part of the public. I have in mind the optimization of budget appropriations and qualitative improvement of the structure of the KGB at the center and at local level.

[Taranov] What is your attitude to the idea of a "professional" army...

[Lapygin] In my opinion such an army would be stronger than the current one. Military hardware is constantly getting more complex and the draftees—yesterday's schoolchildren—are not able to handle it skillfully. Be it aviation, the nuclear submarine fleet, or the missile troops—in the main, the decisive sectors—unskilled people simply cannot cope. This is why professionals—specialist officers, warrant officers, and ensigns—have been manning these posts for years. With the development of technology their share will increase.

What will an entirely professional army and navy cost us? Opinions and methods of calculating the cost vary. It is necessary to subject them to in-depth analysis and discussion. I disagree with those who say that the idea of a professional army should be discarded point blank, so to speak, simply because it is not to the taste of certain military leaders.

[Taranov] What can you say about the involvement of the army in the solution of conflicts inside the country?

[Lapygin] This is extremely undesirable. Containing and settling civic strife is the task of the internal troops, which come under the jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. The role and the duties of the army will be clearly defined in the law on the army which has already been drafted.

[Taranov] How effective are the mechanisms for monitoring Soviet arms deliveries to other countries?

[Lapygin] There is no great problem here. The army itself does not sell anything to anyone. Arms deliveries abroad take place in accordance with interstate accords. It is to be assumed that the new committee will have the authority to obtain and, if necessary, verify information to this effect.

[Taranov] What, in your view, is envisaged by the conversion of the defense industry? What should we discard, and what should we keep?

[Lapygin] Organizations which create new types of arms—scientific research institutes, design bureaus, and their experimental plants—must not be dismantled or placed on starvation rations. Research and development work must not be discontinued. Otherwise we risk falling seriously behind our competitors.

Mass production of new arms is another matter. It "swallows up" a large part of the resources allocated to the defense industry. It is this production that must be reduced and reoriented toward civilian needs.

Huge untapped potential for conversion lies in the elimination of duplication in the work of defense complexes. Quite often we pay for the creation and production of new arms twice and three times over. It would not be so bad if one of the models created by the different "companies" was chosen. As a rule, all of them become part of the arsenal...

[Taranov] What specifically will the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions be discussing at its first session?

[Lapygin] The discussion of the candidacy for the post of USSR defense minister is on the agenda....

PRAVDA Readers' Reactions to Congress Reviewed
PM2106154589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[Ye. Sorokin article under the rubric "PRAVDA Readers on the Congress": "This Is Just the Beginning of Fundamental Changes in the Country's Life"]

[Text] "The unprecedented upsurge in the people's creative forces...." This false newspaper cliche of the stagnation era is now probably close to the truth. All the days that the congress debates—which probably reduced labor productivity and increased electricity usage (just think how many televisions the country has)—were under way, one felt above all the pulse of people's creative ideas. When you hear that the congress allegedly decided nothing and that the deputies only vied as to who could be more eloquent, this is not the case. Because today's liberated thinking is a decision in itself. We have still not finally realized that we have become different. We may not be democrats yet, but we are tolerant and respectful of opposite opinions, and, one way or another, we hear them out. We may not have finally rid ourselves of our fear complex, but we have been inspired by our taste of freedom. We may not be wise, but we are no longer hasty.

Even if this congress had actually decided nothing, it would have been necessary to hold it if only to ensure that people believed in the irreversibility of restructuring. The people who have long believed in nothing and whose every action—even good deeds—make the authorities scent trickery. There has been a kind of emancipation of the serfdom endured by our thoughts.

As a result of this, the readers' "barometer" has sharply swung around toward a democratic plurality of opinions. Probably never since the years of Lenin has PRAVDA received the kinds of letters that it did before, during, and after the congress. The "flood" of letters continues. Incidentally, judge for yourselves. "I do not know 'whom to burden with my sorrows.' I decided it would be you at PRAVDA," wrote Lyudmila Ivanovna Yeshan from Vladimir. "I had placed such great hopes in the congress and was so disappointed when I saw the first sittings! I had hopefully assumed that most people at the congress would have been elected by the people, but I saw to my surprise that two-thirds of them were elected by the apparatus. These two-thirds were mainly engaged merely in accurately reacting to the way in which the head of state understands certain questions and in doing everything to support or, even better, second-guess his wishes and 'trample' on all those who have their own opinions.

"They adopted a very convenient decision. They gave up voting by name. Now we do not know what view to take of our deputies, who have 'pulled a fast one with nobody the wiser.' But we were able to make out some people. You get the feeling, for instance, that the deputies from the Baltic, Moscow, and certain other delegations prepared seriously for the congress. They did not forget for a minute that they were representing their voters, and they had their own well-argued opinions on all issues. I have no confidence at all in the other two-thirds. After all, it was their fault that the congress was several times more conservative than the okrug meetings which had been staged successfully. And that is why I expect nothing good in the future. I would not even be surprised if everything went back to the way it was before."

I will refrain from commenting and will quote another letter. Nina Sergeyevna Barishpolskaya of Kiev writes: "How many agonizing days we war and labor veterans spent around our televisions! We seized on every sensible and businesslike proposal. And how offensive and painful it was to hear the terrible and malicious speeches by certain 'deputies'! Who elected them? Why are they generating ill will? How can they help people if they hate them? We viewers saw very clearly how the same 'deputies' raised their mandate cards both when voting against and when abstaining. These groups will do nothing good for the people. I would like to thank those deputies who honestly and fairly talked about our problems and are helping Mikhail Sergeyevich to cope with our common difficulties. Let him know that our hearts are warm and will never be provoked."

Two letters—two entirely opposed views of the congress' work. And not only of its work. This is essentially a collision of two philosophies, two levels of complaint and expectation even, two ideas of power. And, clearly, our current election law cannot be so bad if it has resulted in the supreme organ of power being peopled not only by "moderates" but by representatives of two extreme social trends too.

I would not be so bold as to call them "left-wing" and "right-wing," as certain congress delegates dared state in numerous interviews before the congress started. Pinning political labels on people is an ignoble and unparliamentary affair. Rather, we have encountered for the

first time since Lenin an entirely real majority and minority which do not have eroded, amorphous "viewpoints" but clear views molded by political and socioeconomic concepts. And these are views on the same subject—how to cleanse the Leninist concept of socialism of its deformations and get the country out of the fetters of Stalinism, the mire of stagnation, and the decades of hostile bureaucratic attitudes to individuals. There is one goal but there are different means of achieving it and different timetables for so doing.

No, today we should not just brush off the minority at the congress. Its proposals contained interesting ideas too. Admittedly, the people have not yet "gotten a feel" for them and hence their trust has had to be given "in advance." "We are not in favor of them, we are against what we already have—empty shelves and empty pocketbooks." That is why things were easier for the minority. It had not yet undermined the people's confidence. Things were far more difficult at the congress for those who from their old starting point traditionally defended the party's leading role, counseled that we should not rush into the hurly-burly of the market or rely on "great leaps forward," and demanded a harmonization of democracy and responsibility. However new their approaches were, this "old" ideological basis prompted rumblings of "Enough! We've heard it all before!" Not for nothing, as opinion polls since the congress have shown, are there far fewer people expecting good changes than people who no longer have any hopes. There are also many who, without having learned of the first steps taken by the new Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions, are already calling their work into question.

"Many commission members," M. Medinskiy of Leningrad wrote about one of the commissions, "come from the stagnation period, and therefore are themselves responsible for illegality. So the result was quite clear to me." "The press represented the deputies in a biased way. Why was our all-Moscow deputy B.N. Yeltsin not once handed the microphone: Did he really have nothing to say?" was the indignant question posed by economist T. Belyayev of Moscow. "Since B.N. Yeltsin was not elected president, this means that the majority in the auditorium was composed of bureaucrats and the party apparatus," is the hasty conclusion of L. Utkin of Moscow.

Only one thing can be said about the work of the Supreme Soviet commissions: Let's wait and see. But as for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, he probably gave more interviews to Soviet and foreign correspondents than anyone else. And he took the rostrum of the congress and the Supreme Soviet on more than one occasion. The fact that his speech disappointed some people is another matter.

I. Velichko of Maritime Kray's Arsenyev City is right when he says "the congress deputies showed their 'teeth' and convinced many people that they are capable of taking the helm of state power. Only they should not give that power away to anyone—neither the apparatus nor the 'bosses,' however outwardly fine they may seem."

The congress expressed the idea that we are still at the early stages of democracy. Incidentally, we have all felt for ourselves that there was a clear lack of standards of parliamentary behavior at the congress. "The congress was sometimes reminiscent of a farce," K. Malkina of Moscow stated in exasperation. "There was shouting from the auditorium, noise, 'canned applause,' and constant appeals from the chairman. After all, the Kremlin is not Pushkin Square or Luzhniki. Some people should remember that." "How much windbaggery, waffle, and 'padding' there was in the speeches, how much time was wasted!" was the lament of L. Prosvetova of Moscow. "Certain deputies," A. Shaytar of Leningrad believes, "took the rostrum purely to appear on television. As a result time was wasted, but in my view the most important issue—that of improving the political system—remained unresolved. That's the price of highfalutin speeches!"

It is hard not to agree with the following letter too. "I was annoyed by the extremely poor equipment provided at the congress," A. Ruygis of Kaunas writes. "As soon as votes started to be counted, 'tellers' with deputies' badges went down the aisles just as in 1918. Although that was not shown on TV—we would have been shamed in front of the entire world."

What can you say? Of course, it is shameful! But you don't teach electronics at primary school. The second congress will undoubtedly take account of the mistakes of the first.

PRAVDA readers have been conducting a special discussion about the congress. Unlike the stagnation practice of "organizing" responses, more and more often newspapers are now regrettably late in publishing readers' opinions. It takes time for the letters to arrive... Clearly bearing this in mind, many letter writers are already stating their opinions about the agenda for the second congress. Draft pensions legislation should be discussed and published for nationwide discussion (S. Ruzhentsev, Orel City); the number of ministries should be reduced and antibureaucracy legislation adopted (A. Filchikov, Tskhaltubo City); the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic should be given the rights of a sovereign republic, the Law on the Cooperative System should be revised, the ban on liquor sales should be repealed, liquor prices should be reduced, and "ceilings" should be established for retail and other prices (P. Kudinov, Riga City); open TV debates between the public and specialists on economically dangerous installations should be introduced (Y. Krivtsov, Leningrad City); a law on ownership should be published for nationwide discussion (S. Zernyshko, Moscow City)...

There are plenty of other questions too. But what is interesting is that there was not a single question that was not raised in one way or another during the congress. It is hard to say where this unity of view between deputies and people came from. Either they had "infected" people with their ideas during the debates, or they had come with the ideas and aspirations put forward by their voters. One can, of course, regret that these problems were not resolved at the first congress. But I am not scared to say that it was good that people did not rush matters and that they gave us an opportunity to openly discuss and weigh up everything in an atmosphere of pluralism. We have already taken many hasty steps in the course of restructuring. The notorious Article 11 (note) is an example of that. Had we not all together managed to make an unambiguous assessment of it, it would have still been hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles. Not for nothing did the congress adopt the truly wise decision not to rush the formation of the Constitutional Oversight Committee. It is all logical. Before electing people to it we should know what it will be doing.

And in this sense we are right to talk about the first congress as a schooling in Soviet parliamentarianism. This very concept, which still sounds strange, is already gaining substance, although not yet at food stores, unfortunately. But life has already managed to convince us that the people's prosperity directly depends on their ability and desire to take power into their own hands.

'People's Power' Needed for Rule-of-Law State

PM2306095189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Establishing People's Power"]

[Text] The First Congress of People's Deputies did not examine a special program for the creation of a rule-of-law state. As a matter of fact, this was not the people's deputies' mandate. But one can confidently claim that the congress itself was a step toward it.

Legal relationships are like blood vessels linking all parts of the state organism—its political, economic, and social spheres. Therefore, the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman's report noted, both the first stage of political reform and all that is to be done at subsequent stages are progress toward creating a socialist rule-of-law state. This idea ran through speeches by many other people's deputies.

Remember that for many years political practice was based on the primacy of state interests over people's interests. We sought plan fulfillment at any price, we erected modern plants without social amenities, and we spent enormous sums of money on armaments, while war invalids eked out a miserable existence... That was the time, it might be objected. But that time began to drag on ad infinitum and we ourselves were beginning to forget that we need the plan, the plant, and peace primarily so that a human being can be a human being. So that his material and spiritual wealth may increase, so that he may be firmly confident of the observance of his legitimate interests, rights, and freedoms. But it was this that he was deprived of by a reality in which concern for state interests was often used as a pretext for tyranny, the violation of constitutional civil rights, central neglect of regional demands, and immovable bureaucracy.

The restructuring initiated by the Communist Party resolutely rejected such a one-sided approach as incompatible with general democratic and socialist ideals and values. The slogan "the state above all else" is a fallacy because, in the first place, you cannot set the one against the other, and, in the second place, the common welfare of the state and its people cannot be built on injustice committed against individual citizens.

Yes, we favor a state that is strong and developed in every respect and we bear the responsibility for this. But society and the state also have a responsibility to every citizen for the observance of his legitimate rights and the inviolability of his person and property. This is an axiom of the rule-of-law state which for a long time they chose to forget.

In this connection we still have a massive amount of work to do, primarily legislative work. In order to implement the historic slogan "Power to the Soviets!" which was heard again at the Congress of People's Deputies, what is needed is not resonant declarations but precise laws. In order to switch the economy to the tracks of genuine economic accountability and independence what is needed is legal guarantees, not labyrinthine departmental decrees. And of course, in order to ensure the observance of human rights, interests, and freedoms, what is needed is not only a relevant article in the constitution but a legal mechanism for implementing the ideas proclaimed in it. It is the supremacy of the law that defines the rule-of-law state.

But how do we ensure that we are living by the law? Of course, what is needed above all is the creation of the kind of legislation that corresponds to the realities of the day. Work, albeit at the moment difficult and slow, has begun in this sphere. The laws on the state enterprise and the cooperative system and a number of others, although far from perfect, are in operation and have to some extent invigorated our economy, have gotten it moving. We look forward to laws on freedom of conscience, on the press, on public organizations, on young people... Criminal, civil, labor, family, and housing legislation will be brought into line with the times, with new ideas and tasks. This is logical. A society that is being overhauled in accordance with the idea of a rule-of-law state cannot sit huddled within a framework of obsolete legal norms.

But it is not enough to have good laws. One must also have an instrument to make them effective, to give them force. For a long time we have lacked that instrument. It is emerging now. Its name is genuine—not sham—

people's power. The Congress of People's Deputies and the new USSR Supreme Soviet—this is real power that is capable of switching our way of life into a genuinely democratic and legal channel. So that the state's interests do not contradict but arise out of the interests of its citizens.

It can be said that the congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet have taken the first steps in that direction. For the first time in our experience people's deputies did not vote for the appointment to state posts of people they did not know but first discussed their candidacies, ascertaining to what extent their work qualities matched the tasks facing the country and whether these people were capable of implementing the projected programs.

The chamber standing commissions and the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been discussing candidates for ministerial posts and for state committee chairmanships. And again the same criterion: efficiency, the ability to think on a national scale, and competence. It is the most serious examination of those who would possess power. An examination of our officials has not been carried out for a long time.

The people's deputies were also able to display steadfastness and scrupulousness in defense of citizens' legitimate rights. They used their powers to revoke the notorious article 11 "note" which was causing discontent in society. Judging by this, the new draft laws which are soon to be submitted for discussion and approval by the USSR Supreme Soviet will be subjected to a most painstaking analysis. And it would not be a calamity if some of them were to be sent back to be worked on further. Society would then be spared laws that do not function, laws adopted out of expediency.

People pin great hopes on the new USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies. The organs of people's power will have to work hard to create a sound legal base for all aspects of social life. This applies not only to the status of the individual and civic relations but also to the activity of the organs of power and management, the economy, and public order themselves.

But it is those who have given the people's deputies their powers, that is, the voters, each and every citizen, who must review many aspects of their own attitude toward life if the efforts of the central organs of people's power are not to go to waste. It must be remembered that democracy is not only a widening of real rights and freedoms but an increase in responsibility and organization. Only by common efforts, only in a calm, businesslike atmosphere is it possible to solve the tasks we have set ourselves. And it is here that the creative activities of the people and their wisdom, self-discipline, and ability to make personal interests commensurate with public interests come to the fore.

The country is going through a special time at the moment. A time of democratic recovery, a time of the establishment of people's power, a time of the birth of a socialist rule-of-law state. It is in our interests that it should all come to pass, and we have the power to make it happen.

CPSU Ideology Aide Speaks on Congress, Reforms

PM2206124789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Course of Democratization"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies confirmed the party course of deepening restructuring and renewing our socialist society. A.S. Kapto, USSR people's deputy and chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, who was meeting with the collective of the Moscow Electrical Vacuum Instrument Plant—the leading enterprise of the Moscow Electric Bulb Plant Association—stressed this in a speech to workers and specialists.

He dwelt in detail on the tasks that were resolved at the congress and spoke of the political situation in the country as described in the reports by M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov. The speaker pointed out that, despite the substantial changes in sociopolitical life and the efforts being made in the economy, the country has not yet extricated itself from the crisis in which it found itself in the early eighties. Moreover, under conditions of democratization and glasnost the public are reacting even more acutely and are even more conscious of the unhealthy phenomena and omissions, especially those relating to people's material situation, that have taken shape over recent years. That is why the disorganization of the market, the country's persisting food and housing problems, the state of medicine and education, and the impoverishment of certain strata of our society were mentioned so trenchantly and heatedly at the congress.

But there is one substantial element to which I would particularly like to draw attention, A.S. Kapto continued. Some speeches at the congress voiced the idea that an economic and sociopolitical crisis has now broken in our country, in the 4th year of restructuring. Thus, like it or not, a slur is being cast on restructuring. People are saying that restructuring has given rise to difficulties. I cannot agree with this viewpoint. The acuteness of the problems was engendered by the state of stagnation in which the country had remained for a long time.

The congress discussed frankly and critically what we must do in the future, the speaker said. Although the depth of this discussion did not satisfy everyone, nevertheless the general conclusion is that the main guidelines for our domestic and foreign policy elaborated and proposed by the party won support in principle at the congress. Of course, the speeches by people's deputies deserve the most attentive attitude and careful analysis. Familiarization with them shows that the interpretation

of the fundamental problems of economic and social policy and political reform largely corresponds with the range of ideas that has taken shape around restructuring. The congress has substantially advanced, enriched, and broadened our notion of the ways to further develop the country, in particular economic reform and the need for a radical renewal of socialist ownership relations. Everything linked with the further development of the political system, with nature, and with ways of resolving the accumulated interethnic problems and questions of developing spirituality and culture, which were voiced with particular weight and trenchancy from the platform, deserves the most attentive analysis.

The congress constitutes a new step in the development of our socialist democracy. This manifested itself in the breadth and freedom of the debates and deputies' speeches over the broad political spectrum. This was a democratic debate in an open and democratic situation. Glasnost was further developed and the live television broadcasts from the congress were an invaluable step in this respect.

The speeches raised the theme of the party. Critical comments were also made about it. Admittedly, the criticism was not always objective. It is clear that the party's guiding and integrating role is an important guarantor and the condition of restructuring today.

In light of the results of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies the speaker spoke in detail about the problems of the party's ideological work. It was patently shown, he pointed out, that the greatest results in restructuring have been achieved precisely in the ideological sphere. The very role of ideological work in public life has changed. It previously acted as the instrument of the administrative-edict system. Hence the didacticism, the excessive exhortations, and the treatment of people as objects of ideological influence rather than as achievers. In the course of restructuring the role of ideology has undergone most substantial changes. For no major step in the economy, the social sphere, and culture can count on success without consideration for public opinion. The monologue customary of the past is now being ousted by broad public dialogue. Like the election campaign, the congress convincingly showed the need for a dialogue which incorporates acknowledgment of pluralism of opinion and the need for debate and comparison of views.

Speaking about the tremendous role of the mass media in shaping public opinion, the speaker noted that the former methods of rigid command leadership of the press have been virtually dismantled. But in conditions whereby the former restrictions and administrative regulators have been removed, new democratic ones have not as yet been created. A great deal still remains to be done in this area.

A.S. Kapto answered numerous questions from the participants in the meeting and heard out their comments regarding the work and results of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, along with proposals from workers, specialists, and leaders.

CPSU's Pugo Speaks on Congress, Party's Role

PM2206143989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Agitation by Means of Actual Deeds"]

[Text] The congress proved an important stage in the transfer of full power to the soviets. Its constructive contribution, judging even by the initial indications, is sufficiently weighty. It comprises the constitution of organs of people's power, the accumulation of experience in democratic parliamentary work, the discovery of new people and fresh ideas, and the buildup of major intellectual preparatory work. The congress was a genuine university of democracy with its unprecedented openness, acuteness of debates, and frank discussion of everything that perturbs the people. This was emphasized by USSR People's Deputy B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, in a speech delivered during a meeting with the collective of the Scientific Research Institute for Production Technology and Organization (Scientific Research Institute for Aviation Technology) in Moscow on 21 June.

The nature of the congress, he said, was largely determined by the election campaign. Never before have there been such democratic and free elections in our country. They produced a genuine explosion of activeness by the people's masses and sharply accelerated the process of their politicization. Democracy ceased being just a slogan. It literally invaded our life.

Touching on the implementation of economic and political reforms, the speaker noted that deputies supported the concept of the country's development as formulated in the reports by M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov. In their speeches, deputies urgently drew attention to the most urgent problems and proposed ways to solve them. The congress advocated the preparation of legislative acts regulating mutual relations between the center and the republics. This is a matter of elaborating a new constitution and an entire series of laws defining and delimiting the powers of the federation, the republics, the autonomous formations, and the national okrugs.

Questions of interethnic relations occupied a special position at the congress. I think that they must be resolved comprehensively. We all must be as vigilant as possible today. It is important to clearly perceive the line separating national originality and national dignity from nationalism. Meanwhile, when coming across irresponsible actions and statements by extremists, some communists and party workers simply give up. Not only do they give up, but at times they actually fall for frankly nationalist attitudes.

There can be no justification to excuse party members who support people trying to impose alien ideals on us and push fraternal peoples in the direction of disunity.

Those who inflame interethnic enmity must be combatted most decisively, right up to expulsion from the party and the institution of criminal proceedings.

The congress, B.K. Pugo went on, despite the broad range of opinions, demonstrated an awareness of the fact that restructuring and democracy are unimaginable without discipline and self-discipline, without a lofty sense of responsibility. This awareness is reinforced by life itself. The accidents and disasters which resulted in the loss of many lives are the consequence of our slackness, of elementary sloppiness, of the habit of working in any old fashion. Unless things change in the future, we will not be helped either by investments, or by foreign currency, or by anything else.

It is especially necessary to launch a broad struggle against crime, which has grown virtually everywhere in the last few years and has become better organized and more aggressive. As far as I am concerned there can be no question about this: The government and the law enforcement organs must take exhaustive measures to combat crime. We are building a rule-of-law state. Not a single state organ, official, collective, party or public organization, not a single person can evade the responsibility of obeying the law. Otherwise we would take the path of anarchy, arbitrariness, and illegality.

The congress itself and the debates which took place there, the speaker noted, brought into full view the problems of mutual relations between the party and the state. The congress backed the idea that our society needs a vanguard force, a bearer of society's program goals, like the Communist Party. At the same time, voices were heard saying: The Congress of Soviets is above the party congress, the Supreme Soviet is above the party Central Committee. I think that we would end up in a blind alley if we were to be guided by the vertical principle of some being above others in relations between party and state. This must be approached as a matter of correlation between policy and power. Being the bearer of the ideas of restructuring and its guarantor, the party determines the goals and strategy of social development, the main line which we pursue. The party's policy is implemented in laws, the plan, and the budget, in other words the activity of the various organs of Soviet power.

The congress heard more criticism of the party than ever before. There was also a desire to make scathing remarks, to play on sharp words, to attract attention. There were also direct attacks against the party, attempts to raise doubts about its vanguard and integrational role in society. But there were also quite a few justified reproaches. Summing them all up, one could say: There are times when the party lags behind many of the processes occurring within society. And yet the political vanguard must restructure itself faster than society as a whole. To quote V.I. Lenin, only someone who is marching ahead can call on others to follow.

The congress reaffirmed that the party's prestige and its vanguard role can be consolidated not by means of directives and instructions but only as a result of steadily growing activeness of party organizations and expansion of their ties with the people. People associate their greatest hopes and expectations with the party and its course of restructuring. This is why they also make the greatest demands of the party. Agitation on the party's behalf must be done by real deeds rather than by agitation workers.

Today we need a strong party. A renewed party whose life and policy are open, democratic, and public. A party serving the people. It must be a party of fellow-thinkers rather than of fellow-believers.

In this context, one could ask: Who is to join the party? The party needs not just workers, not just peasants, not just members of the intelligentsia, but the most conscientious among them, the active champions of restructuring. In other words those who would augment the party's prestige, those who are valued and respected. We must be interested not in strata or percentages but primarily in man, in man's political, moral, and civic stance.

The orator said in conclusion: Opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of Soviet people positively assess the work of the first Congress of People's Deputies and its decisions, but there are of course also some who are dissatisfied. Those who are ready to destroy everything, as well as those who are totally unwilling to change anything. But they both, for some unknown reason, assume that they are the only ones who know the truth or heed the voice of the people. Their position can hardly be described as constructive. In my view, the variety of opinions and the acuteness of debates must bring us closer to the main point—the elaboration of a strategy and the implementation of measures which will rally the party, the people, and society. Only this will ensure the successful solution of pressing problems and act as a guarantee against the emergence of national and social conflicts.

B.K. Pugo replied to questions from participants in the meeting, many of which concerned the activity of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, and listened to their comments and suggestions.

IZVESTIYA Discusses Congress Resolution

PM2906092389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Congress Instructions"]

[Text] The Congress of People's Deputies Resolution "On the Basic Guidelines of USSR Domestic and Foreign Policy" has been published in the press. It is the main document and result of the congress and constitutes the action program for the Supreme Soviet and the government that is being formed before our eyes for the first time.

Two weeks have passed since the Congress ended. By previous yardsticks, there has been a delay in the publication of the resolution. This delay has its own explanation: The drafting commission has been finalizing the resolution in conjunction with the Congress Presidium. A large number of comments were passed on its draft and quite a few amendments—and not just editorial amendments but ones going to the heart of the matter—the definition of the immediate tasks of our state, approaches to the solution of particular problems, and specific ways of extricating the country from crisis—were introduced.

But the deviation from recent traditions was not felt just here. The actual character of the resolution is different and unusual in terms of its spirit, the acuteness of the problems raised, and the boldness and nontraditional nature of the proposed solutions.

The period we are now experiencing is characterized by precise, rigorous definitions without embellishment. A process of assimilation, albeit not without difficulty, of new forms of social life is under way. Economic reform is taking its first steps. The reconstruction of the political system has begun. The foundations of the rule-of-state state are being laid. And furthermore there is acknowledgment that the process of restructuring is difficult and contradictory and that the situation in the country remains complex and tense. The country is not out of crisis yet.

This is felt by everyone of us. When we stand next to empty counters or wait in line we sense the imbalance of the market and the mechanism of an economy riddled with shortages. While waiting to receive an apartment of our own we sense the acuteness of the housing problem. The prices in the market give us an idea of the magnitude of inflation. We judge the environmental situation by the impact of Chernobyl, by the frequency and strangeness of the ailments suffered by our children, and by the anger and pain expressed at rallies in defense of the environment in which you and I live. And many of us now know about the intensity of interethnic conflicts through first-hand experience.

The congress told the truth about the state of affairs in the country. This is no small thing, when you consider what issued forth from the rostrum in the past. But the Congress went beyond that, it tried to answer the question why restructuring is making such difficult headway and what needs to be done to halt the buildup of negative trends and secure and develop incipient positive trends. That is the objective of the whole package of instructions which the Congress has issued to the Supreme Soviet and government.

The congress has demanded that state bodies decisively refocus their attention on people. Their material well-being, social condition, and everyday concerns of life should determine state policy, according to the deputies.

Of course, to achieve a marked enhancement of the people's living standard that is felt by all requires radical changes in the economy, on which we have just embarked, plus time. But there are questions that demand immediate solution. These include the situation of disadvantaged groups within the population. The congress has taken the first steps to improve their lives. This concerns pensioners, invalids, widows, and the parents of servicemen who have died. The congress has instructed the government to incorporate within the new pension system a mechanism for revising pensions at the end of each year in the light of the cost of living index and to devise a system of compensatory measures for people whose income per family member is below the subsistence minimum.

Enormous resources are required to solve these problems and implement other social problems. The congress has indicated where these are to be derived from, namely, by cutting military expenditure to the level of reasonable sufficiency and reducing the overall amount of capital investments in production.

While speaking about the program for improving the national economy, cutting the budget deficit, and supplying the consumer market with goods and services, I would like to draw attention to yet another congress instruction, namely the need to ensure development in conditions of the free competition of diverse forms of ownership—state, local (municipal), and cooperative, that based on leaseholding, shareholding, and individual labor activity, and also various mixed forms. The change in the relationships of ownership is regarded in the congress resolution as a substantial step toward overcoming working people's alienation from the means of production. The congress also concerned itself with ensuring legal backup for the economic reform, instructing the USSR Supreme Soviet to draw up a unified law on the socialist enetrprise and speed up preparation of laws on leasing and leasing relations, a unified taxation system, republic economic accountability and self-financing, self-management, and the local economy.

We are ultimately talking about creating an economic system that is based not on administrative instructions and orders but on law-regulated economic methods of management. It is important to enshrine the principle that as political democracy is impossible without pluralism of opinions, so economic democracy is impossible without pluralism and equality of forms of ownership.

The congress has advocated establishing the paramountcy of the law in all spheres of state and public life and the equality of all citizens, officials, and organizations, without exception, before the law and has stated that any infringement of human rights is impermissible. The congress resolution speaks plainly of the need to bring our domestic legislation into line with international norms and principles, including those enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Agreement, and the Vienna accords.

The congress has instructed the Supreme Soviet to prepare a whole tranche of legislative acts. Legislative regulation of the activity of the mass media, public organizations, associations, and corporations will soon be enacted. It is proposed to draft and adopt a law on freedom of conscience and religious organizations. Legislative acts designed to enshrine the principles of soviets' sovereignty in the economic, social, and political spheres of life are to be ready by the beginning of 1990.

The congress drew special attention to the state of interethnic relations. It advocated the fundamental renovation of the nationalities policy and the provision of real political and economic content to and a precise definition of concepts such as sovereignty, autonomy, and republic economic accountability. The congress has instructed the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities to introduce, in conjunction with the supreme soviets of the appropriate republics, proposals on questions concerning the restoration of the rights of the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tatars, and the Mesketian Turks and the development of small ethnic groups. It has indicated the need to create legal means of solving the very acute and highly dangerous clashes that sometimes arise here, and to rule out once and for all the use of any force in the solution of nationalities problems.

The congress has demanded the creation of reliable safeguards which will preclude any future foreign policy decisionmaking being carried out in camera, among a narrow circle of people, with the people kept in the dark. There is no doubt that the instruction issued to the USSR Supreme Soviet to make a political assessment of the decision to send Soviet troops into Afghanistan will be greeted with satisfaction.

As is well known, a commission to draft the new constitution has been set up in the Congress. The principles of humane, democratic socialism geared toward people in its every manifestation is to be incorporated in the future Basic Law. It was this renewed socialism which deputies advocated. And here they are accurately expressing the will of the people who invested power in them.

Congress Deputies on Ryzhkov Speech, Yeltsin

18001244 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 24, 17-23 Jun 89 pp 1-2

[Article by L. Novikova: "USSR People's Deputies Speak—What Will the Response Be to Our Word?]

[Text] **At the time of the Congress we, the journalists, sat in the balcony. And, as the saying goes, everything can be seen from on high. You can see how the deputies exchange words and how they walk around the auditorium, even during the most interesting speeches; and you can see how they try to "slam the door" on those who raise the most critical and, therefore, not very pleasant problems. From the very first days, the Congress surfaced some brilliant personalities, people who are capable of action.**

The Congress roused the entire country. Indeed, not only the country, but the entire world followed the debates in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. And the fact that we were able to see such a forum for the first time in a live telecast, without cuts, is also an event.

The Congress of People's Deputies did not justify all of our hopes: Too many problems had piled up for us in the years of silence and inaction. But it represents the first and most visible steps of political restructuring, which faces a long and difficult road.

V. Mironenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and member of the CPSU Central Committee:

[Mironenko] As for the Congress, alas, I personally was not satisfied with how specific youth problems were reflected in the report of M.S. Gorbachev, and in the report of N.I. Ryzhkov. I, of course, understand that it is impossible to separate youth from society and that everything new that was proposed and introduced in these documents opens up new opportunities for youth. But, still, strictly youth problems could have been brought out in a broader way, although it is difficult to single out a special youth problem out of the wide range of problems that trouble the entire society.

However, we hope and will ask that the Committee on Youth Affairs, created here jointly with the central committee of the Komsomol, present a report on the youth situation in society, that discussions be held on these problems, and that a draft law, prepared by us, be reviewed in concert and considered at some regular Congress of People's Deputies, and preferably at the next one.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] And how do you evaluate the speeches of the young deputies?

[Mironenko] I believe that our young faction, or delegation, fulfilled its task at the Congress. In my view, the young people displayed not only youthful fervor and energy, but also showed a rather high standard in discussions and restraint.

Zvonov, Chervonopinskiy, Kiselev, and Stankevich spoke extremely well.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Did your faction have its own program?

[Mironenko] I will reveal a secret. It was a simple one. Recognition of a youth policy was achieved at the 19th party conference, during whose development a law on youth was prepared. And there is the idea that I expressed at a session of the Supreme Soviet last fall—to create a Committee on Youth Affairs as a mechanism that would begin to develop this policy. That is it. Now all we have to do is work.

A. Kazannik, docent at Omsk State University.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] When your voters learned that you yielded your Supreme Soviet seat to B.N. Yeltsin, how did they react? Did your action come about spontaneously or deliberately?

[Kazannik] When I analyzed the composition of the Supreme Soviet closely, I became convinced that we did not succeed in forming a professional and intellectual parliament. It is amazing, but very prominent economists were on the other side of the entrance to the USSR Supreme Soviet, there were no sociologists, and even T.I. Zaslavskaya was blackballed. There are also few professional politicians there. And I thought that the loss of B.N. Yeltsin was the most tangible and irreparable loss for the Supreme Soviet. Therefore, I began to think about how to compensate for this loss at least a little, and I decided simply to request that the Congress recall me from the Soviet of Nationalities and that the vacated seat be given to Yeltsin.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] You were confident of positive results?

[Kazannik] No, and therefore I laid down conditions: I will leave the Soviet of Nationalities in the event that Boris Nikolayevich assumes the vacated seat.

I feared that if the voting was secret he probably would be "toppled." Therefore, I set forth this condition.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] And what about your voters, because there are not less than a million of them?

[Kazannik] There were 3.5 million voters, and a majority voted for me. I would say their reaction was ambiguous. Today I received more than 3,000 telegrams. Only 5 did not approve, and of these, 4 were from Omsk Oblast and one was from Moscow, the latter being full of unprintable swear words. I understand that B.N. Yeltsin, as a political figure, cannot satisfy everyone, and, maybe he did not receive someone at some time, and this was simply a feeling of revenge. The voters from Omsk assert that I betrayed local interests, and that I plotted behind their backs with Muscovites.

There is this expression: "point of view" and "a narrow interest point of view". I do not doubt that these voters are looking at things from a "narrow interest viewpoint."

We must look at all political problems from an overall state position, and I am firmly convinced that elections must be made not according to the principle of who you are, but according to the principle of how you can work and to elect the most deserving from among the deserving

To tell the truth, I was alarmed at the Congress by the fact that the deputies who were not included in the list for secret voting screamed from the podium: Who will protect Murmansk, who will protect Volgograd, Rostov na Donu, etc? These are local interests. But the work of professional politicians is to sense the interests of the people and the will of the people and to express them adequately in law. You will agree that this requires professional preparation and a certain level of knowledge.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Excuse me, Aleksey Ivanovich, you are a lawyer, and you could also work professionally in the Supreme Soviet.

[Kazannik] I will say honestly that I wanted very much to get there, and I tried myself to get included on the secret voting list, inasmuch as no one recommended me, and when there was a meeting of the deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], I spoke three times. The first time I tried to show that I was a good person, and that I would be of great value. But this did not work. I was asked: Why were you not recommended locally?

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] And who is supposed to make the recommendation?

[Kazannik] The obkom [oblast party committee], probably. Although I do not understand this at all. But the third time, nonetheless, I tilted the scales in my direction, and I was placed on the list. It was very difficult for me to leave the seat in the Soviet of Nationalities, but in this situation I think I behaved like an honest deputy.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Do you think you will be enrolled in the Supreme Soviet during rotation?

[Kazannik] Perhaps not, because many deputies look at me now as an odious figure.

[ARGMENTY I FAKTY] From the standpoint of a lawyer, how does the Congress approach the creation of a rule-of-law state?

[Kazannik] I carefully analyzed the report of M.S. Gorbachev concerning the basic directions of the foreign and domestic policy of the USSR. It clearly reflects the outlook for the development of our society and state, and, if it is put into practice, it will give us a lot. I am pleased that it also reflects many of the positions of my pre-election program concerning the creation of a rule-of-law state, and the USSR Constitution.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] What do you think the Congress has given us?

[Kazannik] It gave several lessons, both positive and negative. Positive in that we have begun to discuss and express different points of view and various opinions, and I was attentive to the fact that many of the proposals of deputies were taken into account during a revision of a draft decree of the Congress. This is very important because it has not happened in the last 60 years. The second positive point is glasnost. How did the Supreme Soviet work previously? Not one of the deputies received

a single telegram, but now all you have to do is make some kind of a move and the next day you receive dozens of telegrams in which you are praised or scolded.

But there are episodes that have also stuck in my mind for life—I have in mind the trial that was set up for Academician Sakharov. I received about 100 telegrams in which it is said that the war in Afghanistan is our national disgrace, and that Academician Sakharov is our conscience, and do not kill this conscience. When I sat in the auditorium I observed how the deputies ran to the podium, one after the other, and how they insulted Andrey Dmitriyevich.

N. Shmelev, doctor of economic sciences.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] As an economist, what is your impression of the report of USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov?

[Shmelev] The report is very substantive, and it reflects our economic problems. If the decisions taken on it are implemented, we will move from dead center. It is also gratifying that the majority of the deputies, despite the occasional polarity of their viewpoints, are unanimous on economic questions: While we still have not entered a deep economic crisis, it is necessary to develop a mechanism for normalizing the economy.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] But various versions of a similar mechanism have been proposed over the course of many years.

[Shmelev] Indeed, as far back as the 1920's there were remarkable proposals, in my opinion, by Chayanov, Kondratyev, and other economists. But you know how they ended up.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] This is another time...

[Shmelev] Yes, and this instills optimism. While not long ago economists were simply brushed off, now they are being listened to.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Nikolay Petrovich, one of the deputy speakers proposed the creation of a congress of economists where a program for further normalization of the economy would be developed. What is your opinion?

[Shmelev] Think about it. Why do we need such a Congress? Well, several hundred sages will assemble, and they will work up a program for 30 years into the future. But this is not what we need now. We need the common sense of a simple peasant. Because a good peasant with a 4th-grade education feeds his family and also saves for a "rainy day," but with the proviso that he be left alone. We also need this in economics: common sense and the absence of unnecessary commands.

Lukyanov Briefs Moscow Association on Congress

PM2706144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Following the Path of Renewal"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR people's deputy, met with the collective at Moscow's "Spektr" Scientific Production Association 23 June.

I think that before the Congress of USSR People's Deputies opened few people thought that the quiet morning of 25 May would mark the rising of an immense wave of politicization of our society, he said, addressing those present. Now, immediately after the congress, it is difficult and probably impossible to make a comprehensive assessment of this event. We need our emotions and the impressions that affected all of us to die down so that we can calmly analyze what happened. One thing is clear: The congress opens up an entirely new chapter in the political history of the Soviet state. A chapter where the concepts of socialism, the people's power, and democracy have their original and only true sense.

From the outset the Congress of USSR People's Deputies was thought of—and this had already been discussed at the 19th all-union party conference—as a continuation of Lenin's Congresses of the Soviets bearing in mind both accumulated experience and the realities of present-day life. And it worthily continued the legacy of Lenin's congresses. Just as was the case under Lenin, it was a wide-ranging forum reflecting the feelings of all strata of our society, leaving behind, as it were, its imprint and collective portrait with all its colors, hues, extremes of position, and range of political, economic, social, ethnic, and other interests. The congress went far beyond the framework of a purely parliamentary assembly and became a congress genuinely of all the people. If it is to be assessed in political terms, it should be stressed above all that the importance of the congress lies in the fact that it provided further weighty evidence of the irreversibility of the changes, restructuring, and renewal in society's political, economic, social, and spiritual life. The congress pointed up the main avenues of our domestic and foreign policy. It made our political reform more meaningful and tangible. In accordance with the constitution the congress formulated the country's new supreme organs of power, took new steps toward the clear definition, or rather, demarcation, of functions between the legislature and the executive, and made personnel appointments coming within its competence. The congress resolved a highly important organizational question. It elected the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The discussion at the congress has moved us forward in understanding what is hampering the radical economic reform, emasculating progressive ideas, and discrediting decisions that have already been made. The human

nature of the program adopted by the congress—a program which envisages the further increase in gearing the economy to people and to entirely specific population groups, above all, the less well-off sections of the population, pensioners, invalids, women, and children—is a most important and substantive aspect of the congress.

As a broad people's congress, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet stressed, the congress was naturally not aimed at making decisions on any current or operational issues. World practice has long concluded that the elaboration of laws, decisions, or certain formulas is a matter for elective organs that are of smaller numerical strength and more geared to specific legislative work. If we recall our own history, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Central Executive Committee—as is well known—were such bodies under Lenin and during Lenin's Congress of Soviets. The USSR Supreme Soviet elected by the Congress of People's Deputies should become such an organ under present-day conditions.

Does this fact diminish the importance of the congress itself? Not at all! The congress elaborates and formulates the main avenues for the development of society and the state. It changes the constitution and ratifies and adopts highly important laws submitted by the Supreme Soviet. It makes the highest demands on the officials whom it ratifies. And at the same time it is not the congress independent of the Supreme Soviet, and not the Supreme Soviet independent of the congress, but a united state organism embodying the supremacy of people's power that is the meaning of this supreme Soviet-style representative organ which has emerged before our very eyes and is now starting to get into its stride.

Talking about the congress' influence on our society's life, I would like to say that a great deal of what it did was done for the first time. For the first time the state's top officials were elected by secret ballot. For the first time the work of the supreme organ of state power was carried out in an atmosphere of unprecedented openness, stormy debate, and glasnost. For the first time there was live TV coverage of the congress sittings and the USSR Supreme Soviet sessions. For the first time the heated congress discussions showed that the time when highly important political decisions were made in secret is gone forever. And for the first time the people saw the faces of many hitherto unknown people—people who are principled, who think in terms of the state, who are interesting in a human way, and who have been brought into the political arena by restructuring.

The powerful social reaction generated by the congress is shown, in particular, by the fact that more than 141,000 letters and telegrams were addressed to the congress and that more than 2,840 deputies' requests were put to the congress presidium. Some of these were adopted as official deputies' questions, others were sent to various ministries, departments, and organizations. The work associated with their fulfillment will be monitored in the most stringent fashion.

The congress covered all angles of restructuring in our life, clearly expressing an adherence to our socialist choice. At the same time, it showed that there is no single viewpoint on many urgent problems in the economy and politics. Moreover, there is a broad diversity of opinions and positions. Take, for instance, the ideas voiced during the discussion on the diversity of forms of ownership and the development of market relations, the cooperative system, and so forth. Or look at how greatly the positions of representatives from a number of union republics differ.

It has long been said that truth starts as heresy and ends as prejudice. Yes, the path of restructuring is complex. Yes, the social forces associated with it are diverse. But they should not be formally divided up on the "black and white" principle. And we should treat a diversity of ideas and opinions not as an attempt to undermine unity but as a factor in the quest for the best and most effective means of solving the urgent problems which bring difficulties, shortages, and seats of social and interethnic tension to the country's life. Faced with these problems we need unity rather than confrontation, we need joint work to strengthen positive trends rather than the settling of scores, we need respectful behavior toward each other shorn of suspicion and based on complete trust and the awareness of our responsibility to those who elected the congress—our responsibility to the people—rather than a parliamentary talking shop fragmented by opportunistic ideas.

The efforts of Soviet power as it is being renewed and the political work of the party as it is being renewed, will be consistently combined in order to reveal more fully the potential of our socialist social system. This is a most important component in all the preparations for the next, 28th, party congress, for which the Congress of USSR People's Deputies has already put in some good work. I am convinced that the party will do likewise for the supreme organ of people's power.

Turning to the first sitting of the new USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, A.I. Lukyanov briefed those present on the main issues of the current work of the USSR Supreme Soviet session and its prospects. Its working schedule will consist of three stages: the completion of the formation of the Soviet Government and other state organs; the organization of the fulfillment of instructions from the Congress of USSR People's Deputies; and the examination of draft laws and other questions. At the same time it is planned to examine and adopt a number of legal acts of a routine nature associated with the improvement of legislation, the ratification of international treaties, and other issues which the USSR Constitution places within the competence of the Supreme Soviet.

In accordance with the congress' instructions, during the first session the committees and standing commissions will also do work linked with drawing up proposals on amendments to the USSR Constitution, draft standing orders for the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and laws on the status of people's deputies, the procedure for recalling a USSR people's deputy, and others. So the timetable is very busy.

At the end of the meeting A.I. Lukyanov answered numerous questions from working people at the association.

Further Reports on Situation in Fergana Oblast

Curfew 'Partially Lifted'

LD2806112989 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Excerpt] The curfew has been partially lifted in the Central Asian city of Fergana. The situation in the city and its environs has stabilized. The police and security forces are in control. There are still some attempts reported by extremists to keep up the tension. An investigation into communal clashes between Uzbeks and Meshkhetian Turks in the Fergana region has shown it was a deliberately planned act. [passage omitted]

Fergana Party Workers Assessed

PM2906081989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent V. Artemenko article: "Test—Party Workers in an Extreme Situation"]

[Text] The Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic—The bitter aftertaste of the tragic events in the Fergana valley remains in the heart of every honest person and will stay there for a long time. I know that the majority of Uzbekistan's inhabitants believe that the June days are a black page in the republic's life. And in their life. And party workers and party activists call themselves to account first of all.

Party committees found themselves at the center of events. Like a magnet, they drew to themselves all the participants in what was happening. The crowd, armed with spears, axes, knives, and pipes and committing excesses, had its sights set on the party committees above all. The evil forces set themselves a very definite aim—to destroy the party committee and thus deprive people of their mainstay and hope and, most importantly, of faith in the party. But at the same time as the pogrom organizers were heading for city and rayon party committees [gorkoms and raykoms], women, children, old people, and also many men pursued by elements committing excesses were hurrying there too. It was frequently right there that people found sanctuary, and it was party leaders and activists who saved the lives of hundreds of quite innocent people.

Uzbek women and children sheltered from terror for more than 24 hours in the premises of the gorkom and the city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] in Margilan. Gorkom staffers also saved a group of Meskhetian Turks from bandits. Tashlakskiy Uzbek Communist Party Raykom workers sheltered many people of that nationality in their building and, despite being stormed by a frenzied crowd, saved the people from an outrage. The building of Fergana Party Oblast Committee [obkom] also became a kind of impregnable fortress which took in many Meskhetian Turks. Obkom First Secretary Sh. Yuldashev hid a group of Meskhetians in his office, went out to meet the armed crowd, and thus saved people from violence.

All the first secretaries of gorkoms and raykoms in this region came to a recent meeting of the party and economic aktiv in the Uzbek capital, at which the nationalist manifestations in Fergana Oblast were analyzed. The only person missing was Kh. Babadzhanov, the leader of Fergana City's Communists. He is still in the hospital. On 4 June, the day that passions were most strongly inflamed, a huge detachment of extremists gathered outside the cotton plant there. They swept aside everything in their path. They burned Turks' houses, looted public buildings, and tried to destroy the cotton plant too. Khasandzhan Akhmedovich urgently hurried to the new hotbed of extremism. And he boldly went out to meet the raging pogrom organizers. Together with working people of the gorkom, the gorispolkom, and the plant he tried to urge the crowd to see reason. Stones and Molotov cocktails were lobbed at the "truce emissaries." A militia detail fired several warning shots into the air. The response was volleys at those who were campaigning for a dialogue. The gorkom secretary was wounded in the head...

The previous day a savage crowd surrounded Tashlakskiy Raykom and demanded the release from custody of hooligans arrested earlier. When they were refused, the pogram organizers beat up T. Kurbanov, chief of the oblast Public Education Department. Raykom Second Secretary V. Danilov and Rayon Soviet Executive Committee Chairman A. Khadzhimuratov went out to them. But they simply refused to listen to them. They formed a solid circle around them and ordered them to be quiet. Raykom First Secretary A. Sabirov hurried to their aid. And once again hysterical cries filled the street.

"Burn, burn the swine!"

And assiduous "volunteers" were already running up with jerricans of gasoline. But at that moment shots rang out nearby. The public-order forces could not stand such barbarity and stormed in to free the rayon leaders from the clutches of the bandits who had totally lost their heads.

I was to meet with Adyl Sabirov 1 week later. He appeared before me with a pinched face, with "bags" under his eyes. I questioned him about that extreme situation, and he, as though not hearing my questions,

described how people in the rayon were coming out of shock, how the peasants were making up for lost time, and what lessons the raykom was drawing from what happened.

Kokand lived through terrible days. Several thousand brutal thugs burst into the city in motor vehicles, armed to the teeth. They were joined by local bandits. They perpetrated a pogrom for 2 days, storming the city militia department, the party gorkom, and enterprises. Party workers, veterans, and deputies tried to negotiate with them. Gorkom First Secretary Kh. Musabekov has long enjoyed authority among the city's population. But the large crowd, the majority of whom were young people from rayons adjacent to Kokand, gave Khakim Negmatovich a hostile reception. And when he refused to meet their extremist demands, they stoned him. He stood his ground!

Kokand Gorkom workers did not return to their families for a week while they conducted a difficult dialogue day and night both with hooligans and with the frightened population. Meanwhile, party organizers were receiving menacing reports that they and their families would be dealt with. But the Communists continued to fulfill their duty. K. Zakirov, secretary of Novokokandskiy Chemical Plant's party committee, organized self-defense detachments at the enterprise and led them out to combat the instigators of riots. In a skirmish he was beaten up by the pogrom organizers and ended up in the hospital. A. Akhmedov, secretary of the "Elektromash" Plant's party bureau, displayed excellent operational efficiency, rallied communists around him, and together with them boldly pacified the raving people.

Many party workers displayed genuine humanity during those critical days. My notebook contains dozens of examples of nobility. When an inflammable situation arose in Ferganskiy Rayon, Raykom Department Chiefs Zh. Akhmedov and M. Suleymanov quickly and decisively organized the evacuation of Meskhetian Turks to a safe place. Kh. Rakhimov, secretary of the U. Yusupov State Farm [sovkhoz] party committee, openly went around the homes of Turks, organized their departure to a safe place, and saw to their feeding and daily life. Party Organizer Rakhimov was taking a risk, for bandits might have set fire to his home and perpetrated merciless violence against his family, as they did many times to those who sheltered Turks. No, the sovkhoz Communists' courageous leader did not fear threats. Just like A. Sheraliyev, his colleague on the "Muyan" Sovkhoz in Kuvasayskiy Rayon, who created self-defense detachments which blocked the hooligans' path.

N. Rakhimov, first secretary of Kirovskiy Raykom, telephoned the party obkom early in the morning:

"The situation is getting inflamed," he reported. "We have a handful of militia officers, and we cannot cope on our own. Please send assistance."

Obkom First Secretary Sh. Yuldashev refused assistance. It was not possible. He advised raising the people. Rakhimov rang 24 hours later. This time confidence could be heard in his voice:

"People responded to our call. Self-defense detachments headed by Communists have driven the bandits out of our villages. We are in control of the situation, and farms are returning to a normal work rhythm."

People also managed with their own resources in Akhunbabayevskiy, Bagdadskiy, Buvaydinskiy, Leningradskiy, and Frunzenskiy Rayons. Party raykoms organized self-defense detachments which prevented mass outbreaks of terror and violence on their territories.

I wish to give a special mention to female party workers. When Margilan Gorkom workers were negotiating with elements committing excesses in many hot "spots," representatives of one of the numerous groups turned up at the gorkom and demanded that First Secretary Kh. Mukhidinova attend a rally outside the "Uvaysiy" Movie Theater. Naturally, she went. And she saw... no, not a rally but a gathering of hooligans. She saw dozens of people who were beside themselves. Shouts, demands for the release of their "friends" from custody, calls for retribution... Khabiba Yulchiyevna did not quail. And then she hastened to other hotbeds of violence. Kh. Mukhidinova, a mother of four children, was not seen at home for 1 week. The tense situation did not let her go.

I leaf through brief entries in the staff notebook of the Uzbek Communist Party obkom. A report from Ferganskiy Rayon: "Raykom Secretaries I. Ganiyeva and V. Kashun displayed endurance, courage, and the ability to find their bearings in a situation and to make correct decisions. Ikhtiber Ganiyevna and Valentina Vasilyevna worked constantly at their place of residence, organized self-defense for peasants in villages, and risked their lives to take measures to evacuate Meskhetian Turks." Another entry: "V. Avdeyeva, secretary of the furan compounds plant's party committee, displayed endurance and frequently courage too."

However, enough examples. There are many of them. And the conclusion? As was only proper, many party workers were not only the first to receive a blow from extremists but also showed themselves to be real leaders. Rather, they proved that this is what they are. And people followed them.

Nevertheless... I cannot ignore the fact that an ambivalent opinion was formed of party workers in Uzbekistan during the Fergana events, particularly in the oblast of that name. Just what are they not accused of now, just what sins are they not blamed for! My journalist colleagues too have rebuked party workers. This is what I will agree on with all opponents. Party committees above all bear responsibility for what happened. For the abscess had been coming to a head for years. It was nourished by chronically insoluble problems: the cotton

monoculture, unemployment for thousands upon thousands of young people, the shortage of land holdings, housing, and food, ecological disasters, "discharges" of nationalism, and so forth. Did party committees see all these problems? They did. But they failed to take decisive measures.

Moreover, long before the "conflagration," back in the spring, party and soviet organs, KGB departments, and investigative organs began receiving written and verbal signals that the local population was becoming increasingly intolerant of Meskhetian Turks. Other information also stood out clearly. A ramified shadow "staff" of opponents of restructuring was active in the oblast, corrupt circles were rearing their head, and people were coming together to deliberately exacerbate ethnic relations. And no substantial measures were taken concerning those alarming grounds.

"Was it really not possible to extinguish the first sparks and prevent them from flaring up into a big conflagration?" Ye. Sanayev, a Great Patriotic War veteran from the city of Karshi, grieves. "The economic difficulties, this zone's overpopulation, and the unemployment that has embittered people had long been known. And you did not have to be a great politician to foresee the possible consequences. But we are accustomed to catching up with events. The price of political sluggishness is the blood of innocent victims."

It is hard to disagree with the elder. Indeed, why do we come to our senses only after the clap of thunder? The republic government commission recently examined questions of accelerating the socioeconomic development of the Fergana valley oblasts. A special program aimed at increasing the employment of the able-bodied population is being drawn up urgently. Specific measures have been outlined to resolve other important problems too. Thus, it is possible to find a way out. So why was this not done earlier?

Even now the situation in the republic remains dangerously explosive, and many people's nerves are stretched to the limit. But then... unfortunately, not all party workers could be equal to the demands made of them in extreme situations. I saw M. Khalmukhamedov, secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, lose his composure when he received a group of Meskhetian Turks. The discussion was difficult, but... I will not judge how he would behave in more complex circumstances. Comrades from the republic Communist Party Central Committee who visited Fergana Oblast during the pogroms said that even during this very alarming time certain obkom, gorkom, and raykom workers sat things out in their offices and... drank tea.

Among the party workers and the elected aktiv there were—and this must be stated bluntly—people who could not (or did not try to?) overcome confusion. And this increased people's confusion. Take, for example, the Thaelmann Collective Farm in Tashkent Oblast's Pskentskiy Rayon, where many Turks live. The events in Fergana Oblast called forth a bitter echo there too. It was important for the party committee to rally people and set up amicable relations among the multinational population. But Committee Secretary N. Egamkulov was... inactive. It turned out that members of the party committee and the party organization as a whole did not keep in reliable contact with people. And as a result... There was unrest and panic among the peasants. Work was suspended in the fields and livestock units. Crops were becoming overgrown and not being watered. The collective farm—the only one in the rayon—failed to cope with the plan for selling cocoons to the state...

"It has to be admitted that some of our Communists were not up to par even in work on stabilizing the situation in the oblast," M. Mirkasymov, first secretary of Tashkent Party Obkom, said. "Ethnic feelings dim some people's eyes in the fulfillment of their party duty. We are taking measures to make a principled assessment of the conduct of Communists, particularly leaders. Today it is necessary to close party ranks and enhance organization and mutual demandingness and exactingness."

The party commissions under the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and Fergana Obkom are now scrupulously investigating how party workers and Communists showed their worth during the days of trials. I believe that very serious measures will be taken.

Party and economic aktiv meetings, rallies, and meetings between the population and party workers and people's deputies are now being held throughout the republic. Communists are urging their fellow countrymen to observe calm, to combat rumors, and to stabilize the situation, and the response is tangible. People are ready to make up for lost time and to return life to its peaceful path, and they support the specific programs proposed by party committees for normalizing the situation. People of different nationalities agree that it is possible to strengthen the economy and improve social and domestic conditions only if everyone works actively and all together.

Uzbek KGB Chief on Fergana Events

PM2806133989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with N. Leskov, chief of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic KGB Administration for Fergana Oblast, by correspondent A. Kaipbergenov in Fergana, under the rubric "On Events in Fergana Oblast": "More Questions at Present"—date not given]

[Text] Today there are more questions than answers in connection with the tragic events in Fergana Oblast. The investigation is not yet over. The final sentences have yet to be written.

One of the questions that is frequently heard here, in Fergana, is this: "Which way was the KGB looking?" I put this same question to N. Leskov, chief of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic KGB Administration for Fergana Oblast.

"I have no grounds for saying that we encountered some mythical octopus with a single center which had long been carefully preparing the overthrow of Soviet power in the oblast and even in the republic," N. Leskov said. "If that were so, everything would be far simpler. In my view, the roots are deeper and more complex. As many as 10,000 people participated in the excesses. Did they all come out on the mafia's orders? It would be flippant and premature, to say the least, to claim that. It is necessary, first of all, to determine the soil in which the nationalist slogans of extremists, who were at once joined by criminal elements (including from other oblasts), put forth lush shoots.

"In order to understand the chain of interrelated events it is necessary to return to the city of Kuvasay. Last August a Meskhetian Turk, a recidivist thief nicknamed 'Boss,' died in a road accident along with his pals. He had long been terrorizing the city's population with the local militia's connivance, and he was the 'proprietor' of amusement establishments. Criminal elements of Uzbek nationality decided to take advantage of 'Boss" death, because they believed that it was now their turn to be lord in the city. Public opinion, which was directed against the impunity of the Meskhetian Turk 'Boss,' lent them weight and strength. There were clashes through May of this year, but not as organized as those on 23-24 May. Thanks to joint efforts by party and soviet organs, the conflict was then extinguished, so it seemed to us. But the coals were already being fanned by those with an interest in a general unstable situation. I am speaking of criminals and those who were 'offended' by the struggle against corruption."

[Kaipbergenov] Can you name them?

[Leskov] Not yet. They basically financed those committing excesses and supplied them with liquor and drugs. The immediate relatives of the "offended" ones operated here, as they too considered that they had been deprived of the possibility of receiving an income and actively influencing cadre moves and appointments.

[Kaipbergenov] Certain party leaders say that the KGB did not brief them in good time. So, they say, everything came as a surprise to them.

[Leskov] The KGB must not be confused with political detection. We are an organization with our own clearly defined functions. We reported the information we received to party organs in good time.

[Kaipbergenov] What is your administration engaged in now?

[Leskov] We are currently involved in investigating crimes. USSR KGB workers have come to our assistance. Our employees fulfilled their duty during the most difficult days. Thanks to their selflessness we are able to expose arsonists, killers, and hooligans. I wish to take this opportunity to ask the photo correspondents who were working in our oblast during those days to make their materials available to the investigative organs. Today, as you realize, I cannot name the "stage managers" and "performers," but the time will come and this will be done.

[Kaipbergenov] Are the oblast's inhabitants guaranteed against a repeat of the horrors of the first days of June?

[Leskov] What is needed, in my view, is broad explanatory work in every village and city and the urgent resolution of sociceconomic problems. The population's safety is guaranteed today by the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops which have arrived here.

Continued Reportage on Novyy Uzen Disturbances

Ministry Official Cited

PM2806130589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Ladin report on statement by Militia Major V.I. Sivushov, chief inspector at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Cooperation With Mass Media Department: "Novyy Uzen: Toward Mutual Understanding"]

[Excerpts] Militia Major Vladimir Ivanovich Sivushov, chief inspector at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Cooperation with Mass Media Department, describes the latest situation in Guryev Oblast at our correspondent's request.

[Sivushov] [passage omitted] Persons of indigenous nationality assembled outside the Shevchenko City party committee building at 1100 hours on 25 June. They made the now familiar demands that Shevchenko be renamed Aktau, that immigrants from the Caucasus be deported from the oblast's territory, that cooperative enterprises be closed down, and that supplies of food and industrial goods for the population be improved.

The rally participants were addressed by representatives of local party and soviet organs. Constructive ways to solve the most pressing problems were suggested. The rally dispersed at 0030 hours on 26 June. There were no breaches of public order.

An unauthorized rally attended by about 300 persons was held in Kulsary Settlement at 2345 hours on 25 June. It made the demand that tour-of-duty teams be withdrawn from the settlement, that supplies be improved, that cooperative outlets be closed down, and that problems of young people's leisure and employment be solved.

A frank conversation with rally participants was conducted by party officials from Guryev Oblast and Embinskiy Rayon, war and labor veterans, and local elders. People who had assembled for the rally dispersed peacefully at 0230 hours.

There were 14 persons detained for nonobservance of curfew regulations in the last 24 hours.

Oil Output Increasing

LD2806163389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] The events in Novyy Uzen: Work is returning to normal in all the fields of the Uzenneft oil and gas directorate, a major one in the Kazakhstan Caspian area. It provides work for many people and the town of nearly 60,000 people lives, figuratively speaking, on its profits. The smallest disruption in just one sector of the complex economy can lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of tons of oil. This was confirmed by the events of June. The refusal of people to go to work threatened to halt many oil wells. The climax came on 20 June when the work sheets showed zeros opposite the names of 414 oilmen. But the situation is gradually being rectified. The figures for absentees—260, 178, 21, 12, 9—testify more eloquently than any words to the stabilization of the situation. The daily output of oil is also increasing and is nearing the planned level.

"It was difficult at that time," says Nurulubekov, secretary of the Uzenneft directorate party committee. "But we did not give way to panic. People who turned up for their shift would agree to work for those who were absent. It is now only days before our collective will make up for the lag and reach plan indexes. We realize our omissions in the social sphere," Comrade Nurulabekov continues. "And we have already started to correct the situation. We will expand the subsidiary farms, the building sector, and the base for repair of oil equipment, and increase the workshops for production of consumer goods and for providing paid services, and that means new jobs."

Until the well-known events, there were 476 persons originating from the Caucasus working in Uzenneft administration. Despite all the arguments and persuasion, 42 of them and another 9 of different nationalities resigned, but most of them did not feel that way, especially as the initial fears for the fate of their families gave way to a sensible view of the situation and a well-considered approach to the solution of acute problems. With life returned to normal and the definite action of the law enforcement bodies to halt the latest attempts by troublemakers to sow enmity, the town's residents now have hope for peace and calm.

Comrade Gadbeyev, an Ossetian by nationality, has been working for more than 10 years in the rayon engineering and technical service for underground repair of oil wells. This is what he said in an interview with a TASS correspondent: "Unfortunately, some of my countrymen decided to leave Novyy Uzen forever. My family and I are staying here. I believe that the spiritual wounds inflicted in those days will be healed by mutual understanding, trust, and friendship."

Active work among the masses is being conducted by Comrade Marzbekov, a Chechen, deputy chairman of the Solidarity Committee and head of the town's heat supply service. In the past 24 hours there have been no serious incidents. All enterprises and organizations have been working at the normal rate. Investigations into 17 criminal cases continue. Overall, the situation in Novyy Uzen and the surrounding settlements has returned to normal.

Moscow Paper Describes Situation

PM2906075389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition p 6

[KAZTAG-TASS correspondent report: "Events in Novyy Uzen. Yielding to Reason"]

[Text] Novyy Uzen—Reminders of the dramatic events in Novyy Uzen can be seen even today at Mangyshlak station, where trains from the oblast center stop daily. Alongside the station, two kiosks, where skilled watchmakers and shoemakers worked quite recently, stand empty, their windows "gazing" with empty eyes. There were also disturbances at the station several days ago. The windows in certain buildings and in these kiosks were smashed. It is calm here now and traces of the riots are disappearing gradually. In a day or two it will be the turn of these kiosks to be restored.

In Novyy Uzen itself the situation is also returning to normal. High June temperatures lasting several days have finally abated, as has tension reigning here. Transport is functioning normally and all municipal services are operating.

R. Cherdabayev and D. Zhumashev, newly elected first secretary of the Novyy Uzen Party Committee [Gorkom] and chairman of the city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] respectively at Saturday's city party committee plenum and city soviet session, began their workday 26 June with meetings with townspeople. They undertook to resolve the most acute problems and take steps aimed at normalizing the situation and eliminating shortcomings in the socioeconomic sphere and political-educative work.

In his appeal Lieutenant General (Internal Service) G. Knyazev, the city commandant, urged townspeople to be prudent and calm. This met with a response in the people of Novyy Uzen. The city was calm throughout the day 24 June.

However, many details can be cited which indicate that the young city, whose inhabitants' average age does not exceed 25, is in a state of emergency. This can be seen by

the sentries on every corner and the constant encounters with law-enforcement workers, servicemen, and armored personnel carriers with their motors shut off.

At a briefing in Novyy Uzen M. Sarsenov, leader of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] press center, described the situation that had taken shape by 25 June. No active antisocial manifestations, in particular mass riots, were recorded here. MVD subunits have the situation fully under control. Several people have been arrested for manufacturing homemade explosive devices and Molotov cocktails.

At the same time riots took place—in addition to Mangyshlak station—in the settlements of Yeraliyev and Kulsary. Rallies were held in the city of Shevchenko and the settlements of Zhetybay, Munayshi, and Shetpe. Some 70 firearms were confiscated in a 24-hour period 25 June, and 14 people were arrested for breaching the curfew.

It is evident from conversations with people that they have still not all given up their emotions and grievances and many people still have no clear idea of how to resolve the acute conflict. But the people of Novyy Uzen are unanimous on one thing: It is time to put an end to social injustice, bureaucratic tyranny, and official callousness and conceit.

In the apartment block where B. Taganbayev, a cadre worker at the "Uzenneft" Petroleum and Gas Administration and head of a large family, lives, there are only two or three Kazakh families; the rest are Lezgins and Chechens. Neighbors have been living here in harmony for 15-20 years.

"I am extremely dissatisfied with the work of the former municipal authorities," he said. "My son, who is performing his constitutional duty in the Armed Forces, is to come home next year. However, he is not entitled to register in his own home. It is the gorispolkom that has issued this directive. What are the 'gorkom fathers' doing when cooperatives trading at speculative prices begin to spring up like mushrooms? Without producing anything extra, they extracted vast sums of money from people for goods made from products they had bought in the stores. Was it really necessary to wait for an explosion of emotion to force local leaders to face up to our concerns? As for trying to get all Caucasian immigrants declared oppressors of Kazakhs' rights without exception—that is, if you'll excuse me, stupidity. There are light-fingered people among representatives of any nationality. We lived and worked side by side and shared our joys and difficulties together. Why can't we share our land now? The settlement of Uzen 18km from the city appears to be a conglomeration of five or six former Kazakh auls. People here have grown accustomed to the fact that the settlement acts as a kind of manpower supplier for businesses and city enterprises. The saddest thing is that both the leadership of the local petroleum and gas administration and the municipal authorities tolerate this state of affairs. According to U. Bashenov, a driver at the Uzen Industrial Transport Administration, his family, which lives in Uzen, has been waiting for an apartment for 25 years. In this time Bashenov's sons have grown up and settled down to married life themselves, while the housing question is still unresolved. There are no telephones in the settlement, no gas is piped to the apartment blocks, the bath house is on the point of collapse, and the hospital building is in need of repair....

F. Novikov, chairman of the Guryev Oblast Executive Committee, received more than 100 people during the 5 days he spent in Novyy Uzen.

"More than 700 citizens made an appointment for a consultation," he said. "And the numbers are increasing. The former municipal leadership has let work slide and has made ill-advised decisions. What is the good of their 'initiative' to deny the children and relatives of the people of Novyy Uzen registration? Or, say, a young man comes to an enterprise and he is told: Work for 5 years and only then will we put you in line for housing. We have, incidentally, abrogated these resolutions."

It has also been decided to relieve the tension involved in finding employment for young people: Sewn goods factories will be built in Novyy Uzen, Zhetybay, and Fort Shevchenko. The question of opening new production units at the "Uzenneft" Administration, the Kazakh Gas Processing Plant, and other major enterprises and organizations is being considered. A government commission, along with oblast planning organizations and the "Mangyshlakneft" Association, is engaged in elaborating a strategic program for the development of the city and neighboring settlements.

The ad hoc "Solidarity" committee, made up of Caucasian nationals, is carrying out extensive explanatory work among the population. Owing to its activists many seats of tension in Novyy Uzen and neighboring settlements have virtually disappeared. Elders—very old and respected people—have also contributed to this matter. This can be seen by the end of the confrontation between opposing groups and the beginning of the constructive search for ways to resolve the conflicts that have arisen.

The clock says 2100. The city of almost 60,000 people appears to be sleeping: No passersby can be seen on the streets. The curfew has entered into force. It depends on the participation of all the people of Novyy Uzen and on their goodwill and desire for mutual understanding as to when it is lifted.

Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council of Ministers

LD2806172489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] A meeting of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers was held today at which the tasks of the soviet and economic

bodies of the Russian Federation arising from of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee March plenum on matters of agrarian policy in today's conditions, and the results of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies, were discussed.

Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, gave a report.

Baklanov Visits Moscow Aircraft Equipment Factory
LD2006214289 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—"The Congress of USSR People's Deputies has become a striking evidence of the political reform implemented consistently on the initiative of the party, reflected all the socio-economic processes taking place in our society", Oleg Baklanov, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, said on Tuesday at a meeting with party activists of the Moscow machine-building production amalgamation "Znamya Revolutsii", the biggest producer of fuel-regulating equipment for aircraft engines. Baklanov emphasised that such a congress would have been impossible, if it were not for the April (1985) plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the 19th party conference.

"It is precisely the party that made the initiative for radical renewal in all the areas of the life of society which at the turning point of its development cannot do without the guiding and consolidating force. And there is no alternative to the Soviet Communist Party in this", Baklanov said. The secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee took part in the debate, answered numerous questions of machine-builders about various aspects of the life of Soviet society. The exchange of opinion had an open and constructive nature.

Baklanov familiarised himself in detail with working and living conditions of the personnel of the enterprise. Numerous conversations with workers and specialists took place in the amalgamation's shops. Problems of enhancing labour productivity and improving the working conditions were the main topics.

Medvedev, Vlasov Attend Poet's Anniversary Meeting
LD2106082589 Moscow TASS in English 0656 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—A meeting commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of prominent Russian poet Anna Akhmatova was held in Moscow on Tuesday.

The meeting was attended by Politburo member Vadim Medvedev, Russian Prime Minister Aleksandr Vlasov, Soviet Culture Minister Vasiliy Zakharov, public representatives, workers of arts and culture and foreign guests. UNESCO has paid tribute to the poet, declaring 1989 the year of Akhmatova.

The anniversary is being observed throughout the world and especially in the poet's home country. Odessa, the birth place of Akhmatova, Kiev, where she studied, Tashkent, where she lived during the Second World War, and Leningrad, where the poet resided for many years and to which she devoted her best verses, are marking the event.

Akhmatova's poems belong to world literature and win the affection of millions of readers by their purity and deep spiritual penetration, many Soviet writers, speaking at the meeting, stressed.

Brazauskas Proposes Lithuanian Party Independence
LD2806140589 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 25 Jun 89

[Correspondent Roma Jakutyte report]

[Excerpts] A plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee was held in Vilnius today. [passage omitted]

Two questions were on the agenda for discussion at the plenum: an organizational question, and a question concerning the political activities of the LCP today.

LCP First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas informed those present that 15 members and 10 candidate members of the LCP Central Committee had asked to be relived of further activity in the party's elected organs because they had been relived of their posts or because they had retired or left Lithuania.

The plenum complied with their request. Nine candidate members of the Central Committee were made full members. Juras Pozela, president of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, was elected a member of the Central Committee Bureau by secret ballot.

Reading the list of those who left the Central Committee, one fact that springs to our attention is that the people who most ardently defended positions of stagnation are not on the list.

With regard to the second question on the agenda, which was the LCP's political activity today, LCP First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas gave a report. He stood up for the independence of the LCP. According to the party leader's point of view, it is necessary to begin active prepartions for an LCP conference or congress.

In his report, Algirdas Brazauskas admitted that the restructuring process initiated by the party is lagging behind, and primarily within the party itself. Much was expected from the 19th CPSU Conference, which took place 1 year ago. Unfortunately, the progressive resolutions adopted there did not bring about much change.

The CPSU Central Committee is in no hurry to implement the decisions adopted, which causes concern to all of society and to Communist Party members. The number of people renouncing their party membership has increased. This year alone, 1,500 communist party members have turned in their membership cards and the number of people joining the party has decreased. Regulations in the party statutes are being deliberately ignored. Ideological flabbiness and organizational instability are on the increase among Communist Party members. Therefore, the issues of the LCP's independence and prestige within society have arisen with great urgency.

The belief is growing that an objective contradiction has appeard within the LCP, that the level of independent actions taken by the party does not correspond with the aspirations of the republic's people, which is the formation of a sovereign republic. Public opinion polls indicate that the party's popularity is not very high and that the party's prestige does not correspond with its declared role in society. Only a renewed communist organization that corresponds to the demands of the present day can become a real guarantor of restructuring in the republic, Algirdas Brazauskas said. He pointed out that it was time to stop expounding utopian phraseology and plans. In defining the LCP's objectives, our ideals must be set out in words that have been adjusted by experience and time: humanism, freedom, democracy, social justice, and concord among peoples, nations, and states. We must seek points of contact with all positive movements and groups.

Discussing the nature of a Lithuanian communist, Algirdas Brazauskas stressed that his features should be linked with the character of the nation, with the characteristic features of Lithuanians, which are honesty and diligence. It is necessary to resist the obedience instilled in us during our difficult pasts and on the other hand, to resist the national self-glorification that has become so fashionable today. [passage omitted on LCP history]

Today, Comnmunists are blamed for many things. They are blamed for our lost statehood. Algirdas Brazauskas admitted that the Communists did not do everything they could. Defending them from a historical perspective, however, he said that the leaders of the Lithuanian Republic also could be blamed for failing to defend Lithuania's statehood. It was no fault of the Communists that the Polish Government's 1938 ultimatum was accepted, as were the ultimatums of Nazi Germany and finally, after some thought, the Stalinist government's 14 June 1940 ultimatum. Therefore, one must be objective in evaluating history, but neither could the Lithuanian Communists' first mistakes be repeated. They did not see the importance of statehood, so they lost many supporters.

Algirdas Brazauskas set out the opinion of the 1939-41 period and on the events of that time which were fatal to Lithuania. He also pointed out possible ways for Lithuania to achieve its independence now. He said that although we unambiguously renounce the 1939 and 1941 transactions carried out by the Stalin and Hitler regimes, and their rapacious policy toward neighboring states, Lithuania's present status under international law does not change in any way, even though our renunciation is supported by Moscow and Bonn. The same aplies to our assessment of the 1940 elections to the Lithuanian People's Seimas and of Lithuania's joining the USSR. [passage omitted]

Rational people understand that the road to Lithuanian state independence or sovereignty does not lead through a new assessment of the 50-year-old Gordian knot or that it should be cut with a single stroke or that the knot should be untied.

Discussing these options further, Algirdas Brazauskas asked: Will Lithuania be powerful enough to carry out the first way? Will it have sufficient opportunities, understanding, and support from its neighbors, from Europe and the world? This would be a great blow to democratization—which might prove unbearable—to restructuring, and to the new political thinking. We would find ourselves in a vacuum. We would begin to destroy everything we had built. The borders would begin to collapse and the issue of the Vilnius and Klaipeda reigons would emerge once again.

It would be much more difficult to untie the knot, rejecting illusions and great leaps, and accepting the realities of today's fragile world. Going along this road will not guarantee that we will become independent of everything within 6-12 months. However, even though even greater efforts and much more time would be required to proceed along this road, we may say firmly that this path would not be accompanied by tragic upheavals and conflicts, which our small nation can no longer afford.

We do not know what decisions were adopted at the plenum, but I believe that the simple fact that ways of seceding from the USSR were analyzed in the party leader's report will lend it historic importance. [passage omitted]

Algirdas Brazauskas suggested that active preparatory work for an LCP conference or congress should begin now, that an agenda for party action be drawn up, and that the issue of the party's status and independence be resolved. He suggested the plenum recommend that the problems of the LCP's status and independence be discussed by Communist Party members during the July-August period. Moving toward party independence, the necessity of taking a fresh look at our relationship with the CPSU emerges. Algirdas Brazauskas said that today we must declare frankly and unambiguously that we stand for the ideological unity of Communists, for our common ideals. However, we want to find and define for ourselves the means for their realization. The LCP aspires to insure its ability to act and to solve the

republic's problems absolutely independently. We believe that in a state of sovereign republics it is only natural for communist parties to strive for independence. [passage omitted]

However, this essential restructuring of our relationship with the CPSU leading bodies cannot be carried out in a single day. Moreover, these decisions adopted by the LCP would contradict the CPSU program and statutes presently in force, but then this is our objective.

Lithuania's Brazauskas Interviewed on Sovereignty
LD2206132189

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1300 GMT on 16 June broadcasts a 30-minute recording of a "regular Friday interview" granted by Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, to Vilnius radio correspondent Benas Rupeika. Rupeika first comments on Brazauskas's telephone conversation, which had interrupted the start of the interview, saying that Brazauskas answered the phone call from Moscow in a rather angry and firm tone. Brazauskas answers that some ministries and departments in the center have not changed their style of work, although, he says, "some ministries are beginning to realize that the interests of the republic cannot be ignored."

Speaking about first steps toward sovereignty, Brazauskas says: "Until sovereignty has been legitimized, especially in the economic sphere, I would say that current relationships with corresponding all-union departments will be more difficult. This is because the ministries—I will put it this way—which are still temporarily in charge of the economy still hope that this will not happen. And even if it does, then how does one preserve financial, material recourses? Perhaps they would like to skin us somewhat before they let us go. However, we must never forget that everything does not fall from heaven—materials, raw materials, equipment. To dissociate ourselves immediately is a utopia. This is impossible. Therefore, these relations should naturally and gradually grow into different kinds of relations—market relations, relations of equivalent exchange on the basis of direct and established links, and not on the method of distribution which has been in operation until today."

Following this, Brazauskas speaks about the shortcomings of this system and the effect it had on the republics, organizations, and enterprises.

Rupeika then asks Brazauskas if he could confirm the rumors that certain ministries in Moscow are exerting pressure on the republican enterprises for being so defiant. Brazauskas says that he had also heard such rumors, but he could not support these by any official facts or statements. He continues: "However, when I begin to think that this starts happening in reality, I immediately ask myself what the results of this would be. For example, recently the gas production line in Mazeikiai was temporarily out of order, and we immediately felt the effects. What would happen if one day the supply of raw materials were stopped or substantially cut down?"

Following this, Brazauskas speaks about people's discussions concerning sovereignty, rebirth of the nation, and politics, pointing out that he would not like to enumerate all the objectives set out to be achieved. He says that people are forgetting or ignoring the practical side of the whole issue. Some people believe that the leader [as heard] would sort things out for them. Speaking of the present state of the economy, Brazauskas says: "It would be funny if it were not so sad that our economy has gone downhill so much." He continues: "I am not sure if people know that the raw materials for baking bread are imported today. We import food products worth several hundred million rubles."

Following this he speaks about some specific food products, like sunflower oil, and where it comes from.

Rupeika asks Brazauskas's opinion on Ryzhkov's position as voiced at the congress concerning the future of the Soviet economy. Brazauskas says: "I completely disagree with Comrade Ryzhkov, and I think that he understands this issue in a very elementary way. During my discussion with him I said: "Here is such a state as Kuwait, in the Arab world. This is the richest state in the world if the richest are calculated per head of the population. Oil production and oil processing are the main branches of the economy. Marketing of oil and oil products is based on the world market principles." He then draws a parallel between this situation and Uzbek cotton production, saying that because of the principle of distribution, the cotton producers in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic lose out, and have no incentive to grow more cotton. He notes however, that the price of the product, which is in great demand, would be automatically regulated if the equivalent exchange system operated in economic relations.

Rupeika says that the Soviet economy looks and sounds like a colonial economic policy. Brazauskas admits that although calling it strictly that would be an exaggeration, some elements of this could, however, be found here. He adds that only market laws could eliminate these elements of the colonial economic policy.

Rupeika asks Brazauskas what he expects from the Lithuanian concept of economic independence. Brazauskas replies: "I do not think that we could implement it in a short period of time. The state is too large; the methods of economic management are too deep-rooted. If these are good or bad, this is another matter; we maintain that they are no good. We should concentrate our attention on the problems of our republic. Indeed, the Council of Ministers discussed this issue yesterday. A number of commissions have been set up which would deal with certain numerous aspects of our economy: finance, the issue of the monetary reform, ecological problems, utilization of natural resources, planning, and so on."

Rupeika asks: "Having erected a transparent folding screen, will we try to achieve something here by ourselves? I say a folding screen, and a transparent one!"

Brazauskas says: "Of course it is transparent, because we voiced our ideas explicitly at the congress, and so did our neighbors, concerning the implementation of our concept of economic independence. We laid stress on our Economic Sovereignty Law on more than one occasion; main principles of economic management are formulated in it. This was taken rather calmly at the congress and did not cause any reaction which...."

Rupeika, interrupting, says: "Perhaps they follow the principle: Let them do the talking; let them talk the steam out."

Brazauskas says: "I do not think that there is any deliberate opposition to our dreams, so far."

Brazauskas continues by saying that much work has to be done in this sphere, because many economic issues are still in the shape of ideas only, which should be made closer to the sphere of implementation, for example, finance and credits, banks, and so forth. He says that some of these questions are not being solved at the center.

Concerning some changes which are taking place, Brazauskas says: "The thinking of some leaders has been significantly changed by the USSR deputies' congress. This can be said especially about the Council of Ministers. This is now a period of transition."

Brazauskas then speaks about the congress of the Lithuanian Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], which is currently taking place. "In fact, the Komsomol organization is reorganizing itself earlier than the party. This extraordinary congress is the first congress of this type in the union republics."

Rupeika then asks if the Lithuanian Communist Party will model iteslf on the reorganized Komsomol organization of Lithuania. Brazauskas says: "Of course, most principles should be applied in setting up our Lithuanian Communist Party, too. We have been thinking about this seriously recently. This issue will be discussed at our plenum, which will take place next week." Rupeika says that he has heard about a conference of the Lithuanian Communist Party planned to take place this year which would have the powers of a congress.

Brazauskas replies: "These will only be our proposals. Today, it has not yet been decided, and I am not able to make a firm statement. However, we need a program on our short-term actions. We would like to invite representatives of all party organizations for a discussion, so that these discussions are completed by the fall in primary party organizations as well as in party rayon and city committees." He continues: "We understand very well that the party cannot remain in its present state, or retreat."

Rupeika notes: "But there will be opposition, as there was in Moscow; so it will be here, too. Are you aware of this?" Brazauskas replies: "There is opposition everywhere. We have to accept the fact that there will be opposition, and we have to listen to what this opposition has to say because there can be very serious proposals advanced by the opposition."

Brazauskas then gives his general concept of a political party being a group of people sharing similar opinions on the world. In conclusion he says that a party conference should be convened in the fall; delegates to the conference would be democratically elected, and not appointed, as was the case with some delegates to the 19th party conference.

Rupeika says: "It seems that the Congress of Peoples' Deputies has made you more resolute, and not only you, but other leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party."

Brazauskas replies: "Of course, one looks around and realizes what is going on in other places of this huge state, in individual republics and oblasts. One sees how things are in Moscow, and in Leningrad, where the most intellectual Russian forces are concentrated. You see that the circle of like-minded people is growing."

Rupeika starts a discussion concerning the draft election law, noting that all elections of deputies from public organizations has been dropped, and that the elections to the Supreme Soviet will be direct. Answering, Brazauskas says that since the draft Law on Elections has not yet been made public, he would not like to elaborate on the issue. Concerning the qualitative features of deputies to the parliament, Brazauskas says: "Deputies at the parliament must be well-prepared specialists, both in the sphere of economy and state law, and in general these people must understand the running of a state, because very much will depend on this. We cannot have the same content of deputies as before." He notes: "There is still a very large gap between the ideas which we propagate and declare, and real life. We somehow cannot make this gap smaller. I would like to direct much criticism here. For example, yesterday an American Lithuanian visted me. He is a businessman. He was surprised at our declaration of such categorical and extreme political demands without first achieving a sound economic infrastructure and economic foundation. I suggested he appear on radio and television and declare his opinion to the whole of society." In conclusion he says: "Any political sovereignty is impossible without a firm economic basis. If you do not have this basis you are not a partner in politics."

Rupeika concludes the interview at this point.

Lithuanian Deputy Defends Economic Program

18200380 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 7 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by K. Prunskene, doctor of economic sciences and people's deputy from the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic: "What About National Egoism?"]

[Text] At present it is absolutely clear that the sovereignty of republics is inconceivable without economic autonomy. In its absence people do not feel free deep down.

I do not quite understand why some of our colleagues associate economic autonomy with excessive claims by the republics. This is clearly a misconception. We proceed only from the fact that the previous economic model of the union (rigid subordination to the center) has not worked out.

At the May session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], we adopted the Law on the Economic Autonomy of Lithuania. However, this does not mean that we have resolved to sever all at once the ties already in existence. On the contrary, we are prepared to use them, having endowed them with new content. The union of republics, their economic partnership should become mutually advantageous. This is the point of view of Baltic economists. For some reason we are accused of national egoism, and it is forgotten in the process that the Balts are not demanding any preferences and privileges for themselves, and recognize the equal right of all republics to economic advantages.

However, we will not be able to cooperate properly without getting rid of the "strong arm" of the center. How can we talk about equal partnership if some republics start operating on the principles of market economy and others will continue to be based on the command model?

By all signs "The General Principles of Self-Management..." published in the spring will become the foundation toward which the economies of many other republics will gravitate. Therefore, as we think, it is necessary to ensure that there are as few differences as possible between our variant of economic accountability and "The General Principles...." Such agreements are quite realistic and we are prepared to facilitate them, although we understand that the road toward agreement is not going to be easy. After all, not only the central organs, but even a segment of Moscow scientists disagree with us in their opinions on property and finances.

This problem also has another aspect. Sometimes they tell us that we are just trying to replace the Moscow bureaucrat with the Lithuanian one. Of course, this is not so. New forms of management at enterprises themselves are the foremost defense from local administrators. Even now we would be considerably closer to the objective if the enterprises dared to shed the power of ministries more resolutely and switch over to leasing.

Apparently people are apprehensive about displaying commercial initiative because they are not sure they will be able to run the business profitably given our omnipresent shortages. It may be that for now compromise solutions are necessary; for example, bilateral agreements between central and republic management organs. If the center would continue to provide for our enterprises guaranteed deliveries of resources in short supply for some time to come, the republic in turn would pay for them in its products, likewise in short supply, on the principle of equivalent exchange of goods.

We believe that the management organs and enterprise collectives should immediately discuss suggested variants of new economic links, and evaluate their potential. At the same time, they should study what exactly interferes with mutually advantageous partnership—property relations, prices established from "on high," or, say, the absence of wholesale trade—and, finally, work out their own action program.

All the more so, it is time to coordinate and expand foreign links of the republics. Studies of the world market and direct contacts with companies will open up extensive opportunities for developing the national economy.

We associate all of this directly with the issue of real sovereignty of republics. You disagree? Then let us argue and convince each other.

Estonian Interethnic Relations Draft Published

PM2806161789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[ETA-TASS report: "Draft Platform"]

[Text] Tallinn, 27 Jun—Today's republic newspapers have published the draft platform of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee for the CPSU Central Committee plenum on questions of improving interethnic relations.

The draft emphasizes that the democratization of ethnic policies is a key issue in the present stage of revolutionary restructuring. The question of whether the separation (disintegration) of society will continue or whether its unity will become stronger on the basis of the restructuring platform depends on strategic solutions to the ethnic issue.

"The strategic reorientation of the ethnic factor and its reassessment," the draft says, "must, in our view, be the aim of the CPSU Central Committee plenum."

The main provisions of the platform include recognition of the objective necessity for multi-option development for nations and national state formations in socialist conditions.

The document emphasizes the need to assess and draw conclusions from the practice of national state building in the Soviet Union, reveal the reasons for mistakes in ethnic policies, and outline real ways to rectify them.

"It seems obvious," the draft says, "that the sphere of ethnic policy and ethnic relations in the Soviet Union needs to be radically restructured and not just partially repaired. The fate of restructuring will depend on how this is done."

TASS Reports on Draft Platform

LD2706190989 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Tallinn June 27 ETA-TASS—The Estonian Communist Party's Central Committee has put forward a draft platform for a Soviet Communist Party Central Committee plenum on inter-ethnic relations.

The draft, published in Estonian newspapers today, provides for the elaboration and adoption of a union treaty that would envisage the delegation of part of the union republics' rights to the competence of the Soviet Union and the adoption of a USSR Constitution on the basis of the union treaty and the constitutions of the union republics.

The draft proposes recognising the republican legislative bodies' right to suspend acts of the higher bodies of authority in case they contradict the interests of the republic.

In the field of economy, the draft platform envisages the development of inter-regional relations on the basis of cost-accountancy in republics and regions.

The draft also suggests enhancing the independence of republican party organisations, which, as it stresses, does not contradict the ideological and organisational unity of the Soviet Communist Party.

Riga Gorkom Responds to People's Front Appeal

PM1606151289 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 8 Jun 89 p 3

[Unattributed report on Riga Latvian Communist Party City Committee Bureau extended session on Latvian People's Front Duma appeal to People's Front members, plus Riga Gorkom Bureau message to people of Riga and reprint from 5 June 1989 ATMODA of Duma appeal: "At the Riga Latvian Communist Party Gorkom"]

[Text] The question of "The 31 May 1989 Appeal by the Latvian People's Front Duma Board to All Latvian People's Front Members" was examined at an extended session of the Riga Latvian Communist Party City Committee [Gorkom] Bureau on 6 June. Secretaries of party organizations of the city's major enterprises, institutions, and organizations, representatives of the Association of Industrial Enterprises and the permanent assembly of representatives of labor collective councils attached to the city soviet, leaders of a number of sector trade union committees, and also representatives of the Latvian People's Front leadership took part in the session.

As a result of wide discussion, a decision was adopted noting that the Latvian People's Front Duma Board's appeal to all Latvian People's Front members is a serious step toward the destabilization of the political situation. It is clear from this appeal that the Latvian People's Front Duma Board is changing its political line on the further development of our republic's sovereignty and in effect calling for Latvia's development outside the USSR statehood.

The bureau considered it necessary to express its view of the Latvian People's Front Duma Board's document, and to publish this view in the press.

The gorkom bureau instructed party rayon committees [raykoms], party committees, party bureaus, and primary party organizations to carry out broad explanatory work in the labor collectives on the need to preserve the socialist values of restructuring and develop the republic's political and economic sovereignty within the USSR.

[Bureau message] Esteemed people of Riga!

The Riga Latvian Communist Party Gorkom Bureau addresses you in serious concern and anxiety over the situation taking shape in Riga.

The reason for our concern is the appeal of the Latvian People's Front Duma Board to all Latvian People's Front members, which makes clear a change in its political line on the further development of the republic's sovereignty as set forth in the program documents of the founding Latvian People's Front congress.

Today, on questions of the proclamation of sovereignty the Duma Board proceeds on the basis that the desire of Latvia and the Baltic region as a whole to achieve that goal is supposedly encountering increasing political, economic, and ideological opposition from the center and internal reaction. The structural subunits of the People's Front are set the task of discussing the Latvian People's Front's participation in the struggle for full political and economic independence for Latvia.

In this connection the Riga Party Gorkom Bureau is concerned about this: How will the working people and population perceive this turn of events? And are these the purposes for which restructuring began and is proceeding? Is this Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's line, to which the Latvian People's Front Duma leaders have repeatedly declared their commitment? We think not. This statement was deliberately made at a time when for the first time after many decades of voluntarism and

stagnation, the first congress of real people's deputies of the USSR is taking place. We can all see how widely and democratically problems of vital importance to every region of the country and the quest for ways of resolving them are being discussed. We can see the committed and constructive approach that prevails in the work of the Congress and the democratic nature of the judgments. This is the guarantee of the further deepening of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost.

The concrete proposals contained in the Congress speech by A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, deserve praise. They can rightly be described as a program for the republic's political and economic sovereignty within the USSR.

A.V. Gorbunov's speech again confirms the deep inner conviction of the vast majority of the republic's population that our current restructuring does not mean the loss of the socialist orientation, does not set the goal of secession from the Soviet Union, and is not oriented against the vital interests of any national group. Therefore, this appeal from the Latvian People's Front Duma Board struck a note of discord with the Congress atmosphere. It testifies to a lack of confidence in the Congress and its future decisions.

The party gorkom bureau appeals to Communists and nonparty people, Communist Youth League [Komsomol] members and young people, all the city's population, and all mass movements and organizations. Let us consider together where such appeals could lead when the complex tasks of restructuring are being resolved, when our country's people are seeking ways out of the crisis, and when one thing is beyond doubt—namely, that we must all show sincere concern for unity, tranquility, and consolidation.

The party gorkom bureau calls on the population of the city and the republic to show restraint and prudence and not to allow themselves to be drawn into the abyss of confrontation, instability, and division on the basis of national and parochial interests.

We appeal to all Latvian People's Front members to think about where the Duma Board is leading you. Whether now is the time to aggravate the situation and sow anxiety in the hearts and minds of our people, and whether you realize that this will lead still more toward the division of society, the destabilization of the political situation, and the growth of socioeconomic problems.

We call on supporters of the International Front of Working People of the Latvian SSR to view with understanding and patience the complex processes in the republic, and not to give way to emotional flareups, annoyance, and ultimatums. Constructive forces must be helped to formulate and develop real means of political and economic autonomy for the republic within the USSR.

People of Riga! As you know, a CPSU Central Committee plenum that is to formulate a program for stabilizing interethnic relations is in preparation. We expect much from the Congress of People's Deputies, as well as the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum that is in preparation. So let us conserve our energies for further progress, first and foremost for the resolution of social questions and the improvement of living standards for all those who place their trust in the prudence of those leaders who influence public opinion in society.

The party gorkom bureau appeals to all Communists of the city party organization. Today more than ever before we need unity of party ranks for the sake of socialist renewal, the irreversibility of restructuring, and the preservation of the integrity and inviolability of the USSR.

For the sake of this, let us rally our ranks in defense of the true ideals and goals of restructuring, and not allow it to be drawn into the impasse of self-isolation. Today the continuation of the process of restructuring all spheres of our life requires that we all ensure society's political and civic stability and the unity of our ranks.

Let every one of us be permeated by a lofty sense of responsibility for our future, for the future of our children and grandchildren!
[Signed] The Riga Latvian Communist Party Gorkom Bureau.

Appeal of the Latvian People's Front Duma Board to All Latvian People's Front Members

From the moment of its formation the Latvian People's Front set as its main objective that of achieving true sovereignty for Latvia and ensuring its economic, political, and legal autonomy. The view exists that sovereignty could be achieved and realized two ways: within the USSR or outside USSR statehood.

Hitherto the Latvian People's Front, on the basis of the program tenets adopted by the founding congress, has acted on the basis of the first alternative—the federal principle. However, events of recent months indicate that the desire of the Baltic in general and Latvia in particular to achieve these goals is encountering increasingly fierce political, economic, and ideological opposition from the center and the forces of internal reaction. As the tragic events of 9 April in Tbilisi show, direct violence is not ruled out. The course of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies indicates that the conservative majority in the Congress is opposed to the union republics' aspirations to achieve full state sovereignty.

Therefore, the Latvian People's Front Duma Board puts forward for discussion in Latvian People's Front groups and sections a question of vital importance to our people: the participation of the Latvian People's Front in the struggle for full political and economic independence for Latvia.

We see the Latvia of the future as a democratic state in which all citizens, regardless of their national and social affiliation and political and religious convictions, are guaranteed equal rights. Latvia should become a land of humanism and a developed economy, a land guaranteeing all ethnic groups wide opportunities for the development of spiritual culture. Relations with other states, including union republics, should be based on mutually beneficial, equal treaties.

The Latvian People's Front Duma Board believes that the people of Latvia will have the final say in the attainment of independence. The Latvian People's Front Duma Board believes that the means of achieving this goal are both the parliamentary struggle, using the present power structure in the Latvian SSR, and the direct expression of will by the people. It is the goal of the Latvian People's Front to achieve state independence for Latvia and ensure legal guarantees that will give the people themselves the opportunity to choose the form and mechanism of political power. It should be realized that the path to the attainment of this goal will not be easy: it will demand political responsibility and firm commitment on the part of all Latvian patriots, regardless of national and social affiliation.

It is our urgent task to secure the adoption at the 16 June Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session of a declaration on Latvian state sovereignty and amendments to the Latvian SSR Constitution on the property rights of the Latvian SSR and the ratification of USSR laws, as well as the adoption without delay of a law on Latvian economic autonomy.

Since a favorable outcome to the elections is regarded as a basic prerequisite on the path to the attainment of free political development and independence for Latvia, it is necessary to bring about the formation of a coalition of all progressive forces for the coming elections.

The Latvian People's Front Duma Board views with understanding the idea of forming citizen's committees, seeing these as an extreme means, arising from the consequences of totalitarianism, for the defense of the rights of Latvians and other indigenous inhabitants of Latvia. However, their activity should be developed widely only in the event that the question of Latvia's state independence and the nation's right to self-determination cannot be ensured by parliamentary means.

[Signed] Latvian People's Front Duma Board, 31 May 1989.
(ATMODA No 22/23, 5 June 1989)

Two New Local Leningrad 'Front' Groups Emerge

18001264 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by T. Putrenko, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent: "Front Against Front; Two New Social Organizations in Leningrad"]

[Text] Leningrad—The establishment of the Leningrad People's Front [LNF] was announced here the other day. About 700 delegates, representing numerous enterprises and organizations in the inaugural congress, discussed and approved a declaration of the front and ratified its regulations. Governing bodies were elected. The congress said that one of the tasks of the front is the development of a specific program of action on the basis of a study of public opinion of Leningrad residents. Among the tasks of the just-created social movement is the advocacy of the economic sovereignty of Leningrad and the oblast on the basis of the development of local self-government. The People's Front also intends to resolve such a complex task, in particular, through the deputy corps. It proposes to nominate candidates from the LNF at the forthcoming elections to local and republic soviets.

Another organization—the United Worker's Front [OFT]—was also established during the last few days. The new social movement, which literally got started in the last month, proclaims a program that is generally similar to the program of the People's Front. It sets as its task the consolidation of workers, employees, intelligentsia, veterans, and youth, on the basis of Soviet patriotism, in a joint struggle for the betterment of the life of the people and the restructuring that is necessary for this. "Why does the city need two fronts, and won't a confrontation occur between them?" is a question that many Leningrad residents are asking. How will the activity of the OFT progress in the future? It is not known whether it was a coincidence that the appearance of the not-unknown Nina Andreyeva at the inaugural congress of the "second front" was met with applause. She was even offered a role in the governing body of the newly created organization. But this was followed by non-acceptance.

Bessarabian Anniversary Marred by Protesters

LD2806194989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] The anniversary of the liberation of Bessarabia from the yoke of the Romanian monarchy and its reunification with the Soviet homeland is being widely marked in Moldavia at present. By tradition, one of the locations of these celebrations is "June 28th" Street in Kishinev. Toward the end of the working day, the vivid colors of festive flags, slogans, placards, and floral displays blended with the greenery of its age-old trees. The events of this memorable date—28 June 1940—have come to life in the exhibits of museum displays, historic photographs, newspaper articles from the time, the documentary films being screened here, and the tales of the guests of honor at fesivities and the veterans of the Bessarabian underground. A little later, the celebrations continued in the (?Okyombriya) palace, one of the republic's biggest concert halls.

A shadow was cast over the celebrations, however, by a group of people who had come here before the start of festivities carrying tricolor flags with ribbons of mourning and provocative placards and slogans distorting the historical significance of the date. They wrecked the

planned performances of artistic collectives and tried to provoke passers-by into clashes and confrontation, lending the proceedings a negative tinge.

NKAO Sees Azerbaijan 'Interference' Continuing

PM2806160089 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 7 Jun 89 p 4

[Karen Zakharyan report: "Karabakh Meetings: Travel Notes of Our Special Correspondent"]

[Excerpts] The "quiet" life ended for Nagorno-Karabakh when the Karabakh Movement began. Historians—not false ones (false historians, as Cervantes said, should be executed as forgers)—real historians still have to study in depth the origins and causes of this movement, describe in school textbooks what it is still difficult to describe even today, assess various phenomena in the progress of the entire movement, and perhaps pronounce a verdict on those who themselves wanted to pronounce a verdict on the movement, with only one goal—to destroy it in the cradle.

Today the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh is on strike. Anew. Yet again. This general strike began 3 May, covering all the sectors of the national economy that exist there except the vital ones: medicine, agriculture, part of the trade sector. No one knows when the strike will end, since, some say, much will depend on the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, or, others say, on how the Karabakh question is resolved in general. [passage omitted]

On the day I arrived, just before the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, they were discussing the recent session of the Stepanakert City Soviet of People's Deputies. A report on it had already appeared in the local newspaper, and people were, as usual, enlarging on the report in their own way. But even in the newspaper there was sufficient information.

"The session deemed it necessary immediately to restore the functions of the oblast party committee [obkom] and the oblast soviet of people's deputies. The Special Administration Committee should fulfill the role of central leadership organs, taking the place of the leadership of republic organs of administration and some of the union organs."

"The session instructed the USSR people's deputies elected from Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to convey to the congress the nature of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem..."

Later, in Yerevan, following the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, after the speech by Boris Vartanovich Dadamyan, deputy from Nagorno-Karabakh, I called city party committee [gorkom] First Secretary V. Atadzhanyan in Stepanakert.

We liked our deputy's speech, Valeriy Abgarovich told me. He represented correctly to the congress participants the essence and concept of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Self-determination is the only way finally to resolve it.

We were even more convinced of this earlier, when we saw and heard the speeches by Suren Gurgenovich Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and Academician Viktor Amazaspovich Ambartsumyan.

It is gratifying to note that the Nagorno-Karabakh problem has become a nationwide idea and has entered people's hearts. This is inspiring.

People at the gorkom are apparently concerned about precisely this: Why has the Karabakh problem hitherto been presented firmly as a territorial dispute, and nothing more? We will talk about territory later, people argue, after the constitution has been changed. But **today it is a question of continuing interference by Azerbaijan in the internal affairs of the oblast, which, under the well-known decree, received the right to autonomy in resolving its own affairs.** Where is the [Special Administration] Committee? Why is it silent?

I wanted to ask these questions to members of the committee. I put them to Semen Amayakovich Babayan, with whom I met by chance in the village of Nakhichevanik in Askeranskiy Rayon. He was on a kind of inspection tour of the villages here, and I did not want to waste his time.

"The ultimate aim of the Karabakh Movement is the reunification of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia," S. Babayan said. "There can be no two opinions about that. After all, in our day, when all the stereotypes of the Stalin-Brezhnev period are collapsing, it is entirely logical to put the question in this way: Why should one and the same people live divided by symbolic borders within a united Soviet land? I can see only one answer here, which will probably soon be heard at the Central Committee plenum on the nationalities issue. There will have to be constitutional changes, of course. But for the time being the oblast has the status of a special district, and the Azerbaijan leadership will have to deal with that, whether they like it or not. I think that once the widening of the powers of the Special Administration Committee takes concrete form, much will change for the better here.

[Zakharyan] Are you talking about the committee's actions, or the normalization of the sitaution in the oblast?

[Babayan] Both. As for the strikes, this is an enforced measure, although it is unacceptable in principle. I do not understand, for instance, how people can stop work in construction, when there is an acute shortage of housing. And what about the roads? After all, if our rural roads were improved, many people would remain in the villages, and also it would be easier for the refugees.

[Zakharyan] But is there, in the context of what you have said, a front line for construction work? I was told that, for instance, the Stepanakert No 91 Construction Administration was supposed to commission five apartment blocks and a kindergarten last year, but not one of these projects has been completed to this day. What is to blame for that—the strike, or the poor supply of construction materials?

[Babayan] There is indeed a problem here. We are indeed poorly supplied with construction materials. At first it was envisaged that supplies would come from Armenia, and we put in orders for our projects there. But the earthquake tragedy halted the progress of our plans. I do not know whether the potential exists in the republic to carry out even part of what it was planned to build in the oblast, but at the moment, when there are just as many difficulties in repairing the damage, I do not want to talk about that, to be honest...

[Zakharyan] Couldn't the Special Administration Committee reorganize these positions, so to speak, and resolve the question of supplies for construction via Moscow?

[Babayan] That could be done in the event an oblast construction association is set up, but this is only in the initial stages. It is also important to single out the development plan and budget for Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast as a separate item in the country's general development plan. All this forms part of the "portfolio of rights" that the Special Administration Committee needs in order to administer autonomously.

But for the time being we cannot deal with, or rather, overrule the Azerbaijani leadership on questions of socioeconomic development. Hence all the distortions that exist in this development... [Babayan ends] [passage omitted]

Program Discusses Ukrainian National Identity

LD2806141589 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2100 GMT 20 Jun 89

["The Nationality Issue: A Search for New Approaches"—presented by jounalist Viktor Moroz, speaking to (Ihor Losev), philosopher and lecturer at Kiev State University]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Moroz] Today, I would like to dwell on our Ukrainian affairs. What are our specific problems? Are there, in your opinion, any specific ways of solving the nationality issue in our country?

[(Losev)] I believe that if one is to speak of specific features, then it could be said that the position of the Ukrainian people has been, perhaps, the most difficult. What I mean by this is that there is a virtual absence of any experience of self-government over a period of many years. There are huge problems in instilling a national self-awareness, educating an intelligentsia. The nation has, in fact, not had time to shape itself fully. What I mean by this is that there has not been enough time to create a culture as an entity. There were some elements....

[Moroz, interrupts] ...in the twenties.

[(Losev)] Yes, of course. The point is that only in the twenties did the people start achieving the creation of itself as a nation. And indeed these years will remain forever in our memory, because this was a fortunate historical opportunity for the whole nation.

[Moroz] That is to say that essentially, socialism—in the first few years of its existence—gave Ukrainians the opportunity to create a nation.

[(Losev)] Indeed. After the tsarist times, after the well-known bans on the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian culture and the Ukrainian indentity as such, this was the first time there appeared a chance to have a reliable historical perspective. The specific nature of the problem for the Ukraine lies in the fact that for us, there is no internationality conflict like that in the Baltic region or the Transcaucasus, but the conflict lies in fact within the Ukrainian people themselves—between the Ukrainian-speaking and Russian-speaking Ukrainians. Perhaps this is why the situation is perhaps not as critical as in the Baltic region or the Transcaucasus. But, this is, of course, just one side of the issue—that there aren't any internationality clashes normally. This is good, naturally. But as far as national identity itself is concerned, it is more complicated.

I feel that one should not hurry here, because this situation has been built up over many long years. We must not seek an easy solution, because the easy solution is not always the best one. Now we are concentrating on language primarily.

[Moroz] The state status of the language...

[(Losev)] Yes. This is of course correct, but we must instill a feeling of elementary responsibility for the fate of one's people, elementary responsibility both before one's ancestors and one's heirs. Because if you have only language, without history, without culture, without an elementary national pride, without an understanding of the value of one's own national identity, of its unique and unrepeatable character—that is, a person must perceive his people as some kind of unique creation, a treasure—without this, the language will not have the necessary support. [passage omitted]

I would like to add that the question of nationality is not just a cultural or linguistic question, but primarily a political question. And one must start from real status of the nation, real status of the republic within the framework of a multinational state. One should start from the question of sovereignty for the republic.

[Moroz] Forgive me, I must interrupt—but the posing of the question on sovereignty—is it possible, ideologically correct, within such a multinational state?

[(Losev)] We must, after all, depart from the fact that sovereignty is necessary, but the type of sovereignty that is achieved by the nation itself in a democratic way and takes into account the interests of other national groups as well. It is said that only the nation itself can decide its fate. That is right and it is on this basis that the very principle of national self-determination is built. But, we have to take account of some real factors as well. For example, how possible is national sovereignty in conditions of a multinational country? Is it possible at all, or is it just some kind of error of logic? It is my view that multinationality, and I would say even multistatehood, of a country—because we are talking of the existence of a whole group of sovereign socialist states under a common roof, so to speak—I feel that such a thing is possible. Especially as we have the example of certain Western European countries to follow. Take Switzerland. There, there truly exists sovereignty of four groups, different national cantons, which embody the principle of sovereignty. And naturally, we in our country can also resolve these issues. We must take advantage of the present opportunity and define our sovereignty among the sovereignties of the other Soviet republics. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Activists Help Radio Liberty
PM2106141089 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 11 Jun 89 p 4

[Special correspondents M. Derimov, Zh. Rudenko report: "Debut of the Trojan Horse: Conversations After a Speech at the Lvov 'Memorial' Conference"]

[Text] Lvov—The founding conference of the Lvov organization of the historical education society "Memorial" was in progress. People who are well known in the oblast—writers and scientists, journalists, teachers at higher educational establishments—spoke movingly of the society's noble tasks: to find out the names of the innocent victims of Stalinist repressions, perpetuate their memory, and give assistance to those who are still alive.

But then a certain L. Lukyanenko made his way onto the conference platform—and immediately there was a disturbance in the air. To begin with, this man stated that the Bander UPA [Ukrainian Insurgents Army] "was not an army of bandits," and then, involuntarily paraphrasing the favorite expression of Hasek's Second Lieutenant Dub, called on those present to study Lenin "from the other side." The essence of this "study" amounted to malicious abuse and "historical revelations" like this: If the Petlyura regime (which was supported, as is well known, by the bayonets of interventionists) had not collapsed in 1920, then...World War II would never have happened! The speaker went on to make a direct attempt to kindle interethnic enmity by talking about "slavery," the "oppression of Russian power," and how Russia supposedly "foisted on" the Ukraine the "status of an occupied nation." In short, these were variations on the theme of the slogan of the modern-day Bander supporters abroad, "Kiev against Moscow."

Some people clapped: There were people in the hall who found this aggressive nationalist sally to their taste. Some people were indignant: "What are we doing here? Get to the point!" And the speaker hurriedly "rounded off" by telling the audience that the Ukrainian Helsinki Union fully supports, as he put it, the "people's movement [rukh: Ukrainian for "movement"] for democracy in the Ukraine."

Let us not mystify the reader any longer: The L. Lukyanenko who spoke at the conference of the Lvov Oblast "Memorial" society is the chairman, already mentioned in our newspaper, of the "Ukrainian Helsinki Union." Let us remind you that not long ago Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH called the members of this group "the most zealous nationalists," while we have good reason to believe them to be paid informers for America's Radio Liberty and the foreign nationalist press. Lukyanenko clearly hurried here from the Chernigov region, where he lives, specially to make the debut described above before the intelligentsia of Lvov.

And it must be noted that neither this nor the equally provocative speeches by some other Ukrainian Helsinki Union supporters met with a due rebuff at the conference from the Communists taking part in it—members of creative unions and employees of scientific institutions and higher educational establishments. Nor was a single word said about the Trojan horse that the Ukrainian Helsinki Union is trying to introduce into the midst of certain esteemed figures in science and culture: We are referring to the Ukrainian Helsinki Union supporters' declaration of support for the project to form a "People's Movement" in the Ukraine.

We therefore asked some of the participants in the conference to assess the program principles and daily practice of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, and also to explain their own position with regard to the support that is offered to them by this group of suppliers of disinformation to Radio Liberty.

Poet Mikola Petrenko, winner of the Pavel Tychina "Chuttya Yedynoi Rodyny" Prize, told us that he has never taken an interest in the Ukrainian Helsinki Union's program. But he sometimes listens to Radio Liberty's broadcasts in Ukrainian. Has he noticed that in these broadcasts a key place is given to information from "correspondents" from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union about "events" that they themselves provoke?

"Yes, I remember how they used the Radio Liberty airwaves to call for a boycott of the elections and the theft of ballot papers. This is, of course, interference in our internal affairs by the radio station...."

Our interlocutor stresses that he is against extremism and against "provocative acts leading to the exacerbation of the situation." He does not regard the Ukrainian Helsinki Union extremists with favor. He did not like the way that at last year's rallies I. Makar, V. Chornovil, and the Goryn brothers, elbowing everyone aside, "climbed onto the pedestal of the Ivan Franko monument." In his opinion, people like that would "insult anyone."

"However, I do not like going to rallies," Mikola Petrenko says. "I prefer concrete work in organizations like 'Memorial' or the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society. There is a lot of work there. I am in favor of the movement, of the rukh [movement: Petrenko uses first the Russian word, then the Ukrainian]—or rather, I am in favor of close coordination of the activity of specific societies that already exist."

"But all the same, the Communists working in those societies should perhaps keep an eye open to see what alien forces support them?" we asked, returning to the question of support from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union.

[Petrenko] "But is the Ukrainian Helsinki Union a force? Surely it is just a small group of people."

[Correspondents] "We agree. But does not the presence of these people, whose nationalist activity is well known, compromise the esteemed societies you have spoken of?"

Unfortunately we received no answer to that question. Our interlocutor again started talking about matters on which we agree with him entirely: the facts about the Stalinist repressions, the stagnation caused by the administrative edict system, the need to put an end to all kinds of infringements of the law....

On parting, we showed Mikola Petrenko a report by Bill Keller published in THE NEW YORK TIMES on 9 March under the heading "Ukrainian Intellectuals Challenge the Communists."

The poet sighed:

"Goodness, the things they write about us! I cannot help recalling Tychina: 'Let them do as they like—they are crazy....' [quoted in Ukrainian] And so forth."

We talked with Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Ye.A. Gryniv, chief of a department at the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences Institute of Social Sciences. He, incidentally, was elected deputy chairman of the Lvov "Memorial" at the aforementioned conference. We asked him for his opinion on the "support" offered by the Ukrainian Helsinki Union supporters to those who advocate the formation of a "People's Movement," and to certain newly formed culturological societies.

Yevgeniy Andreyevich said that by virtue of the sociological profile of his department he has been studying informal movements for 2 years, and he began his argument with the well-known fact that we should take these phenomena seriously and seek cooperation in any constructive work. But does that apply to the Ukrainian Helsinki Union informers for Radio Liberty? Comrade Gryniv felt he could only reproach them: "The trouble is that they suffer from megalomania, think of themselves as prophets, and prescribe formulas." But in spite of this he sees nothing disgraceful in their penetration of such autonomous associations as the Ukrainian Language Society or "Memorial." This argument by the esteemed social scientist sounds odd in this context: "After all, there are neofascists in the West, and they operate legally there."

Well, it is true enough that we need to consolidate our healthy forces, when there is so much restructuring work ahead of us! But again and again we recall the hysterical utterances at the Lvov "Memorial" conference by the "chief," L. Lukyanenko, and his like.... We remember how I. Makar declared at recent rallies that he "no longer intends to discuss anything" under red banners, how V. Chornovil flung at the crowd the scornful epithet "homo sovieticus," and B. Goryn, seizing the microphone, "constructed" the latest provocation, kindling passions....

We asked:

"If you listen to Radio Liberty, if you look at the information supplied by the Ukrainian Helsinki Union that appears in foreign nationalist publications, can you regard that organization as constructive?"

[Gryniv] "Of course not. As for Radio Liberty and other specific information organs, they are what they are. They would not be themselves if they used official Soviet sources. But if we are to acknowledge the right of informal structures to exist, then we must also acknowledge the right to informal information. True, only if it is not directed against our system, our policy, and the unity of our territories. Otherwise it is hostile information."

Then Yevgeniy Andreyevich recalled:

"I, for instance, have complaints of my own against Radio Liberty. On the last Sunday in May, on the initiative of our 'Memorial' society, there was an authorized rally at the 'Druzhba' stadium. On the Monday, reporting this, the radio station's announcer named only the speakers from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and did not mention the well-known Lvov scientists, public figures, and other people. That is how disinformation is created—first for the West, and then for the population who listen to the radio. In short, disinformation was launched in order to inflate the 'importance' of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union. And there are many such cases."

After these conversations, we thought: Time will certainly tell who was really promoting restructuring and who was retarding it with their orations at rallies. But it is already obvious that a conciliatory attitude toward antisocialist phenomena cannot be justified.

Rail Minister Interviewed on Bashkir Accident

18290209 Moscow GUDOK in Russian 18 Jun 89 p 3

[Interview with USSR Minister of Railroads N.S. Konarev by GUDOK editors: "Pain, Compassion, Hope"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] [GUDOK] On 16 June, the government commission completed its work. You were a member of the commission. Has the exact number of fatalities and those injured been determined?

[Konarev] Not yet. The data are being made more precise; behind them is the pain caused by the loss, and, at times, good news. For example, yesterday brought us unexpected joy. Some passengers who were considered to have been in the explosion, and were unaccounted for, turned out to be safe and sound. They got off the train earlier, to visit relatives: some in Chapayevsk, others in Ufa. Ten persons were scratched off the tragic list.

At present, 658 passengers are being treated in the hospitals of Ufa, Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, Kuybyshev, Gorkiy, and Moscow. One hundred and five have been discharged and sent home. Altogether, as has been determined as of the moment of this interview, 1,241 persons were riding on the two trains.

[GUDOK] There are railroad employees among those who have perished in the fire or died in hospitals. It is possible that some of the survivors will be handicapped. What kind of financial aid can the families which have lost a breadwinner count on? What kind of benefits will the handicapped get?

[Konarev] The highest possible. This is envisaged by a decision of the government. In addition, with the consent of the Central Committee of our trade union, it was recommended that the labor collectives where those dead or handicapped as a result of the tragedy worked establish monthly payments to complement benefits, and annual grants-in-aid. Particular attention should be paid to families. A roundhouse or another enterprise should become another home to them.

[GUDOK] I believe that many of our readers thought that the fate of families which have lost breadwinners and of the handicapped would turn out to be more definite, and would not depend on the generosity or miserliness of individual councils of labor collectives. Many raise the issue like this: Children should receive the average amount of the salary of their parent until they are of full age; the same goes for the handicapped.

[Konarev] I will offer assurances yet again that we will not leave the people to face alone the misfortune which has befallen them.

[GUDOK] What is to be done in order to prevent such misfortunes from happening again, in order to protect the passengers and railway workers from the explosions of special-contingent cargoes, slipshod refinery product pipelines, and other disasters? Have you raised these issues in the USSR Council of Ministers in your capacity of member of the government?

[Konarev] Thank you for this question. Here is the answer: For example, we have insisted on many occasions that excessive secrecy concerning cargoes of the USSR Ministry of Defense be lifted, and methods of their packaging and preliminary processing be applied which make them safe for transportation. Unfortunately, our requests were received as unnatural, as some kind of a particular advantage which the MPS [Ministry of Railroads] was supposedly seeking. [The explosions of railcars in] Sverdlovsk and Arzamas have proven that our concerns have been legitimate, and have not at all been selfish. Now Bashkiria reminds us that not only the Ministry of Defense, but other ministries as well are responsible for the safety of passenger transportation.

Indeed, an area with such a cluster of energy-related installations as the Bashkir Autonomous Republic has should be a zone of particular militance and discipline. The Kuybyshev Railroad intercepts with refinery product, gas, oil, and ammonia pipelines over 6,000 times.... However, this has only been summed up now. Every intercepting section should be known to the railroad personnel, and made as safe as possible.

[GUDOK] Shouldn't these installations be commissioned with their participation?

[Konarev] Absolutely. It looks like we have managed to secure this in Bashkiria. Unfortunately, even now our managers are shifting some of their responsibility to the oil and gas industry personnel. It became known that they were testing the reliability of the system at the refinery product pipeline where the tragic leak occurred. We were outraged: Why wasn't the MPS invited? It turns out such an invitation was received by the chief engineer of the Bashkir Department of the Kuybyshev Railroad, but he did not respond duly. We should put an end to such cases of indifference in service once and for all. We should work out a program for the safety of transportation in a responsible manner, together with all ministries and offices.

'Truth' About 1957 Nuclear Accident Revealed

18220151 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by A. Lyapustin: "Thirty Years Have Passed"]

[Text] The truth about what they now call "little Chernobyl" was hidden from the inhabitants of Chelyabinsk for more than 30 years. However, at the time everyone knew a little or a lot that something had happened. But they did not know exactly what had happened or how dangerous it was.

In those years Western radio broadcasts reported the explosion on the territory of Chelyabinsk Oblast, but there was not a word in our media. In general they tried to hush up accidents and catastrophes, especially at a defense facility.

What happened in 1957?

According to B. Nikipelov, first deputy minister of medium machine building, who came to the oblast in response to an inquiry of the USSR people's deputies, a conventional explosion—not a nuclear one—occurred and destroyed a container of radioactive waste. A contaminated cloud covered the territory to a width of 9 km and a length of 100-105 km. More than 10,000 people had to be urgently resettled.

At that time I was studying at a railroad tekhnikum and was doing my practice work at the Sinarskiy station. I took part in that resettlement. People, frightened by the sudden decision and uprooted from their homes, held out red-banded papers which ordered us quickly to allot containers and sell tickets. Then the evacuated villages were burned. The glow on the horizon was that of a terrible obscurity. Everything done was in low voices or in minced words. There was a list on the door of the railroad dormitory, explaining how to tell contaminated fish from noncontaminated fish. There was an order not to buy potatoes outside the market. That was all the information.

Do you know how awful it is to see a flowering apple tree when it is flowering next to nettles growing in the ashes of former fires? The obelisk to the heroes of the civil war on the former main street appears like a memorial to the burned village. This spring I saw it again—the green-covered swells of land of that long-ago deactivated area.

Today the numbers and facts state that the emission of radioactive elements was approximately 2 million curies (in comparison, at Chernobly 50 million curies were released), and the measures to deal with the consequences of the accident cost R200 million (in current prices).

B. Nikipelov reported that no one died in the explosion and that no cases of radiation sickness had occurred. Academician L. Buldakov, the deputy director of the USSR Ministry of Health's Institute of Biophysics, confirmed on Chelyabinsk television that serious consequences had been successfully avoided thanks to speedy evacuation of the population. However, a decrease in leucocytes was noted in about one-fifth of the population on the contaminated zone, and a much sharper decrease in thrombocytes. There was no significaint deviation in the level of blood diseases or malignant tumors.

All this is somewhat reassuring. It is good that finally everything has been said openly to the Chleyabinsk residents. It is true that this happened only after widely attended ecological meetings, only after an insistent inquiry by the people's deputies. But the Chelyabinsk residents are not sure that all their questions have been answered.

Not long ago we laid to rest the Chelyabinsk photojournalist Viktor Shanov, who died of cancer and who had a short time before this buried his parents and his wife. They all came to Chelyabinsk from the shore of the river Tech, which to this day is cut off from the villages by a barbed wire fence. To this day one-fifth of that territory has been declared a "preserve." As before, places exist in the oblast where mushroom gatherers advise one another not to hunt.

I think it is now clear why the Chelyabinsk residents reacted so sharply to the news about the construction of the South Urals AES, and why they demanded it be stopped until an ecological evaluation could be carried out. Yes, there is an energy hunger in the Urals. The first "ration coupons" will be introduced not to the population for meat, butter, sugar, soap, and detergent for the population, but to the enterprises, for electric power. Broadcasts on Chelyabinsk radio begin with the weather and the Chelyabenergo report: Today enterprises will be supplied with power according to schedule number such and such. Why have they made the decision for us? This is what the Chelyabinsk residents ask.

The high-level leadership told the oblast's inhabitants that construction of the AES would be halted until the expert's commission made its conclusions. What has already been built could be reprofiled, let's say, as an instrument making plant. The oblast's inhabitants themselves will make the decision. How will they vote after a small and a large Chernobyl?

1957 Disaster, Nuclear Plant Siting Linked

18220149 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent N. Terekhin: "The Echo of an Accident Passed Over in Silence for More Than 30 Years"]

[Text] **Passions continue to rage in Chelyabinsk Oblast over the issue of whether a nuclear power station in the Southern Urals is to be or not to be.**

Following the Chernobyl tragedy, the issue of building a nuclear power station in any region is received with pain. However, this issue is many times more acute for Chelyabinsk: 3 decades ago, a catastrophe happened here, the consequences of which have not been fully eliminated to this day. However, the truth about it has been hidden from the public behind the "top secret" classification for all these years.

A paradoxical situation has emerged: People in the vicinity knew much about what had happened (to be sure, with varying degrees of credibility). However, all

questions regarding the causes and extent of contamination ran into the stubborn reluctance of competent organs and officials. The wall of silence was torn down by ecological meetings in the Urals. Their participants stated categorically: A constructive dialogue on the nuclear power station is impossible without learning the truth about what actually happened in September 1957 in the vicinity of the city of Kasli.

Complying with the instructions of their electorate, a group of people's deputies from Chelyabinsk Oblast is preparing an inquiry to the government on the economic feasibility of building the South Urals Nuclear Power Station. Meanwhile, the issue of the need to release the data on the accident was raised with USSR Minister of Medium Machinebuilding L. Ryabev. As a result, First Deputy Minister B. Nikipelov arrived in Chelyabinsk.

According to what he said, then, in 1957, a vessel in which radioactive waste was stored was destroyed by an explosion (conventional, rather than nuclear!) at one of the defense industry enterprises. A cloud of compounds lifted by the explosion covered an area of about 1,000 square kilometers. Its trace, which was 8 to 9 kilometers wide, extended for more than 100 versts. More than 10,000 people were evacuated from the contaminated zone on an emergency basis.

The release of radioactive elements is estimated to have been 2 million curies. For comparison, it may be said that in Chernobyl it came to almost 50 million. As early as 1978, economic operations were resumed on 80 percent of the contaminated area. On the remaining 20 percent, a... nature reserve was set up. To be sure, houses cannot be built and furniture cannot be made with the trees growing in this preserve. In these "wilderness" areas, the animals and the fish emit radiation as well...

Conventional losses due to the appropriation of land amounted approximately to 7 million rubles a year. About 200 million rubles in contemporary prices was spent in order to clean up after the accident. As the deputy minister sees it, the most important point is that not one person died as a result of the 1957 accident, and not one case of radiation sickness was registered.

Deputy Director of the Institute of Biophysics of the USSR Ministry of Health L. Buldakov gave more details of the medical aspect of the issue speaking on TV. He noted that grave consequences could be avoided due to the timely evacuation of people from the contaminated zone. Nonetheless, reduced rates of leukocytes in the blood were noted in one-fifth of the people residing in the territory affected by the release [of radioactivity], and in rare cases, also of trombocytes. However, no considerable deviations from the norm in both the incidence of diseases of the blood and the incidence of malignant tumors have been registered among the populace. As far as remote consequences are concerned, observations will be made...

In a word, the talk in front of the TV camera boiled down to the fact that the citizens of the Southern Urals have no reason to be concerned about the construction of the nuclear power station as well. Moreover, this accident long ago was not associated with a nuclear explosion or defects in a nuclear reactor. As far as the secrecy surrounding it is concerned, this was due to the defense interests of the country.

In the course of the conversation, B. Nikipelov stressed in particular that at present an independent ecological review of the station design is in progress which will make everything clear. The construction of the unit of the nuclear power station is suspended until the review is completed; work is proceeding on auxiliary installations only. In addition, the deputy minister offered assurances that the Ministry of Medium Machinebuilding would only resume the construction of the power station when the citizens of the oblast as well consent to building it.

It would appear that they have gotten all they wanted. A sincere conversation has taken place, and nobody has anything up his sleeve. After all, has it ever happened that the leaders of one of our most secret ministries would talk so openly about their failings, even if it dated back 30 years? Everyone would have been happy with the dialogue had it not been for one "but": in the course of the TV broadcast, the citizens of Chelyabinsk have failed to receive answers to quite a few questions.

For example, the people are very apprehensive of the fact that the Ministry of Medium Machinebuilding is still the investor for the nuclear power station which is to make up for the shortage of electricity in the oblast, rather than the Ministry of Power and Electrification. What is the explanation for the site for its construction being selected in the immediate proximity to the very same defense enterprise where the old accident occurred? Is it only the desire to attract to the station the skilled personnel already available here? References to the proximity to the bodies of water with elevated radiation backgrounds, the water from which will be purified by evaporation in the technological circuits of the reactor, appears to be a weak argument. Finally, by now every schoolboy knows that a nuclear reactor produces not only power, but also, say, plutonium used both at nuclear power stations and in nuclear weapons. In turn, the drift of the conversation is such as if the Ministry of Medium Machinebuilding had no need for the station whatsoever.

In a word, there are many questions. It is hard to expect that the citizens of Southern Urals will come out in favor of continuing construction unless exhaustive answers to them are given. Fears of a possible catastrophe cannot be overcome by stories about the participation of enterprises of the Ministry of Medium Machinebuilding in centralized servicing and retooling of the dairy industry of the oblast, its meat-packing industry, and in housing construction.

Unfortunately, many people here, in the Urals, still remember this emergency evacuation, the fear of the unknown, the need to abandon all possessions, including every last chicken, every last bit of firewood. I myself saw large vacant lots covered with stinging nettle where at one time large villages used to be. Out of these villages, the people moved into panel board, so-called Finnish, homes which, as the officials assured, had a life expectancy of 15 years according to some data, and as many as 40 years according to others. Either the guarantees turned out to be inflated, or the homes were assembled in a hurry—either way, at present it is simply impossible to live in many of them. It looks like no one is concerned with this. Given this, how can you believe the promises?

"Even after our meeting with the representative of the Ministry of Medium Machinebuilding here, in Chelyabinsk, many points remain unclear," believes member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy from Chelyabinsk A. Penyagin who, together with S. Naumov and M. Lezhnev, prepared the inquiry by deputies. "Yes, indeed, there is a shortage of power in the oblast. As a metallurgist, I know this well. On the other hand, why is only the construction of the nuclear power station being argued about, and alternative variants do not figure in the discussion at all? First of all, [there is] the issue of using energy-efficient technologies. Western countries have long been following this route. We still do not have an efficient, solid, scientific program. Virtually no progress is being made on the issue. Let us assume we will build the nuclear power station, and in 30 years the energy units will have to be dismantled. Who will answer for that?"

At present, the citizens of Chelyabinsk are expecting the conclusions of the commission of experts. However, even if it comes out in favor of building the station, are the citizens of the region going to make such a decision? It is difficult to convince the people that the nuclear power stations are safe following the 1957 explosion in the Urals and the Chernobyl accident. There should be a maximum of sincerity in this kind of conversation. However, this is, unfortunately, not the way the conversation turned out. Everyone understood this based on the following detail. The host of the TV program asked twice why the river Techa still flows between two rows of barbed wire, fenced off from the entire world and villages on its banks. Twice this question went nowhere, and was left without an answer. Is this the arrogant silence of the ministry once again?

Suffering From Chernobyl-Related Illness Continues

18001257 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4
[Letter from reader and editorial comment: "Confession of a Veteran of Chernobyl. Written From a Hospital Bed"]

[Text] I am Valeriy Fedorovich Zosimov. I am 34. I am writing to you for the first time. I want only to write what for us, the people of Chernobyl, is obvious: People of middle and advanced age and young people (still mainly men) are suffering and dying (still quietly, one at a time). The blame here is that their weak hearts have been unable to cope with stress following the accident....

I was born in the Kirovograd area. I went to Pripyat in 1976 with my wife Antonina; she was 18 then, I was 21. They were building the Chernobyl nuclear power station [AES]. I believed it was necessary to build it. They worked on several shifts and on their off days. There were times when the schedules were tight and we worked three shifts in a row. I received a medal "for labor valor." Meanwhile, there were sports. More for the soul, of course. And there were successes, and we skied and exercised with weights and went shooting.... I also tried the marathon. I was not infrequently named best sportsman in the city, and I won first prizes in the oblast.

That terrible spring of 1986 was hot. I remember because many termites had appeared. Like flies, but gray and long, with long wings. They flew about in swarms. On 26 April something so absurd happened that the mind could not take it in. Early in the morning, about 0500, I slipped into Kiev to meet my family. We returned in a private car. We reached Kopachy, not far from Pripyat, near the station. A captain with a portable radio gave us permission to leave the vehicle in Kopachy and from there walk home to Pripyat. So, we went.... My 10-year-old daughter, my wife, and me. Ahead and behind people were also walking, and from Kopachy the destroyed fourth unit could already be seen. Where the power transmission line crosses the road there was a long band of graphite smoke. I shook the light black flakes from my coat, and they immediately dispersed. We arrived home at night (later a large part of the forest around that path was declared hot and came under the ax—it was dangerous there! Just as it was when I walked along it with my family?)

Then, 27 April—an attempt to go to work by bicycle. Some military person in a respirator pointed a hand toward me and then made a corkscrew motion on his temple. I made a sound: It was very dirty there.... I returned home and along the road I met the chief. He said: "Leave with your family, just leave us an address." By that time I was a worker at the Chernobyl AES—a controller in the bureau of technical control. The acting chief, V. Kravtsov, said: "We are there now, unfortunately, but nothing can be done. But when they have to restore things we shall be greatly needed."

I firmly believed that and so was completely fooled.

I returned to work on 30 June. Between the evacuation and specific participation in the cleanup following the accident I caught up at the institute and completed a course ahead of time; they were already waiting for me there, at work.

When I got hold of a radiation monitoring detector and went to Pripyat—home—it turned out that this instrument was "too" sensitive for our apartment. Yes, a great

deal of contamination was recorded there. Particularly on the clothing that had been worn in the "hot" forest. And this was 6 months later!

Following the explosion I naturally gave up sports and stopped training—there was enormous tension, and the moving about. There was a dryness in the mouth, a tickling in the throat, and people coughed all the time. During the early days of May I tried running 5 kms. The perspiration poured from me, weakness overtook my entire body, and I was dreadfully tired. Now I understand that during that period we were simply inhaling the aerosols.

The shifts started on 30 June. They built a separating wall between No 3 and No 4 power units, a storage facility for nuclear fuel waste, and a gallery; they repaired units Nos 1 and 2 and restored unit No 3.... In the summer and autumn we were overcome with fatigue. But many people joked about it and made crude remarks.

By the autumn I was having persistent headaches. My arterial pressure was elevated. At first, "cosmetic" measures helped. Then it became more difficult. I felt that my health was deteriorating. I had to leave. But where to go? My strength was fading. By now no one believed the nonsense and the assurance that the medical people were giving us—everything was in order—and we laughed, but carried on working. Once a month we also laughed about the "disclosures" about the dose everyone had received. Even simple arithmetic did not make it possible to accept those figures seriously.

Time passed. Life flowed on. And in January of this year illness forced me to my bed (like it did many others) with a pre-infarct condition. I was taken in an ambulance from Zelenyy Mys to Slavutich. At first I could not walk, then I got a little better. Everything was wrong—a burning in the bronchi, the stomach, the bowels, headaches, elevated blood pressure, nausea. A month in the hospital and a month in the sanatorium. I barely made it back home there. I went back into the hospital on the 25th. There they said: We cannot deal with this again, it is a complicated question, this must be turned over to the Medical Commission for Determination of Disability! I went to the city commission at my place of residence. I set out again, this time for Kiev, to the Radiology Center.

A doctor of science, a professor, a former military man, made the rounds. He was in a great hurry. He asked what dose [of radiation] I had received. I know that I did receive a dose, but officially I did not. "You," he says, "are a young man and here you are sick. Well, just get better!" This, of course, is what I want, but tell me how.

Another 2 weeks passed. The professor comes round again: "How are things?" I say: "Bad." The professor turns to my physician, Ye. Matova, and says: "You have kept him too long, discharge him. There is no connection between his illness and the radiation." Matova replies: "There is a link here, he should be treated!" Two hours after this conversation, for the first time in 4 months of severe illness I realized in conversation with the pulmonologist that I was talking to a professional, to some honest person—Viktor Aleksandrovich Sushko. He performed a bronchoscopy and said: "Your bronchi still need serious treatment." But three hours later they discharged me....

Now things are bad with me. I have been in this condition for more than a year; it is almost too much for me. It is hard to be doomed. It is doubly difficult to be doomed by those who should be protecting me. If a machine breaks down it is taken to the repair shop. It is amoral to compare a man to a machine, but yet.... We are talking about a rule-of-law state on every corner, and yet we cannot protect ourselves (against the state?) on the social plane. We cannot do this. But if we remain silent about this today, then tomorrow it will be too late to shout.

I am probably not a man whose history will be written. I am only a private person who perhaps made a very small contribution to the cleanup after the accident at the Chernobyl AES. But it is not just me. I am merely a feature of the great problem that, whether we like it or not, we must resolve. Immediately. So that we do not once again at a later date have to grieve, and look for the guilty among the pensioners.

I sense that what I am writing is rather confused. I probably have not expressed myself very well, or left out something. It is the middle of the night here in Kiev but I cannot sleep; my head is aching, I have a bitter taste in my mouth, and a pain under my rib. What do I have in my soul? Pain. I am so young, I want to live, help me! All I can hear is "get him ready for discharge, get him ready for discharge...."

The specialists walk round the radiology center: Here is material for science! The future doctors of sciences are walking about there. True, they are not all charitable. They say: There is no link with the radiation. They write "gastritis."

P.S. Before the accident, in 10 years I twice took the bulletin of the ORZ [acute respiratory illness] for 3 days. Now the list of my "achievements" from the record of the history of my illness takes up more than a page. I am passing on my pain to the newspaper, which, I hope, will not put it in their archives. I shall be happy if readers can be brought even one millimeter closer to knowledge of the real history of the cleanup after the accident.

It is now 0400. It would be good to go to sleep....

From the Editor

Unfortunately, such declarations are not a rarity in our mail. The complaints usually come from the oblasts of the Ukraine and Belorussia and concern the post-Chernobyl

resettlement and those places that are now noted on the radiation maps (that should have been made public 3 years ago) as "not favorable." But not just from there.

Here are figures that were made public this spring: About 600,000 people passed through the 30-km zone. Most of them took part in the cleanup following the accident. After completing their assignments and receiving a (greater or lesser and perhaps an insignificant) dose they went back to their native places. Others were demobilized and also left the "zone." Then the problems started: So many of them went to their physicians with complaints and it was recognized that they had worked or served at Chernobyl, that the medical people are suddenly changing their diagnosis, passing them on from one facility to another, and trying to get rid of unwanted patients....

Various "Chernobyl people" are coming into the editorial offices. An officer, a helicopter test pilot, a bulldozer driver, a former Army private.... They have one thing in common—they were all drafted into the Army or worked as volunteers to save the country from disaster. But today no one needs them, and they are fighting the redoubts of the bureaucracy. And what about the health of those whom we were praising in the summer of 1986, the "biorobots" who were called on to clean up the roof of the machine hall at the Chernobyl AES and remove the radiation "contamination"? How many of them in those terrible places received does in the hundreds and perhaps the thousands? Or?... We still cannot get an official answer to this. I am convinced that it is essential to give legal recognition to those people—all the patients who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident. Then questions of their treatment, social security, pension, and problems of housing for them and their families can be resolved normally. Not as some exception, but as the standards of a rule-of-law state, the veterans of Chernobyl should be given help.

All the medical ills of the Chernobyl people are being ascribed to radiation phobia, which in truth has seized many people. But first, radiation phobia is largely the result of lack of publicity. Those to blame for this are first and foremost the specialists who decided that silence is golden. Second, radiation phobia itself is an extremely dangerous joke. It is giving rise (as the medical people now admit) to extremely serious and sometimes dangerous treatment. The real diseases are diseases of the heart and the stomach, disorders of the nervous system.... To cover up this echo of Chernobyl is simply criminal. Even if a direct link with ionizing radiation in the history of their illness has not been recorded in patients, they are nevertheless casualties. It is immoral to forget yesterday's heroes no matter what problems they are presenting for the country today. Because "one fine day" it may be that we issue another appeal to people to save society from a new "calamity," and the answer will be silence.

IAEA Approves Gorkiy Nuclear Plant Siting

18220150 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Jun 89 p 1

[Article by TASS correspondent S. Turanov, special to SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA: "No Man Is a Prophet in His Own Land"]

[Text] Vigorous protests by the citizens of Gorkiy against the construction of a nuclear heating plant (AST) in the vicinity of the city prompted an invitation for experts from the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency], affiliated with the UN, to evaluate its safety (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 10 June 1989). Recently, this group completed the first stage of its work—an expert review of safety features of the Gorkiy AST design. A meeting with representatives of the public in the House of Culture of the I.V. Kurchatov Institute of Nuclear Energy became sort of a report by the group on the results obtained.

Head of the group Ye. Yaremi stated immediately: "We believe—and this is a unanimous opinion of all members of our group—that the master draft of the Gorkiy Nuclear Heating Plant has been done to a high standard. Increased safety of the nuclear plant is ensured by the main equipment being located in one building and isolated from other elements of the station on the principle of "Russian nested dolls." The volume of hollow space in the building is selected in such a manner that in the event of loss of sealing in the reactor circuit the fuel of the active zone will always remain under the water line. The pressure and temperature of the heat transfer agent are substantially lower than in power reactors: pressure—by a factor of 10, and average water temperature—by a factor of 2. The average temperature of fuel is also considerably reduced, which is responsible for a noticeable reduction in the yield of products of its fission.

The experts gave high marks to the peculiarities of design of the reactor housing which make it possible to retain radioactive products within its confines even in the event of loss of sealing. Among the advantages, they also mentioned the fact that in the event of an accident at the reactor installation the transfer of heat from it will last for at least a week, which rules out the overheating of the active zone.

The principle of natural circulation of the heat transfer agent is used in the reactor of the Gorkiy AST, which makes it possible to do without pumps or other means of forced circulation of water through the active zone, which are prone to failures. The station has considerable momentum: its systems respond to the actions of the operator after a considerable period of time. This does not only make his work easier, but also provides considerable leeway for correcting eventual mistakes. Proven materials and components which have already been used at nuclear power stations the world over are used in the design of the reactor.

"Here is one more point which greatly impressed us," continued Ye. Yaremi. "It is the number of tests which the equipment for the station has undergone. These have mostly been large-scale experiments. Their number has been considerably higher than is usually done on most reactors in the West...."

"No man is a prophet in his own land"—states the biblical piece of wisdom. However, even the group of 16 IAEA experts, which included leading specialists from nine countries, did not immediately succeed in gaining trust.

"Can your evaluation be considered objective given that all of you as specialists are interested in the existence and development of the nuclear energy industry?"

"This is no reason for endangering one's reputation," came the answer. "All the more so because, with regard to this specific project, all of us are independent persons. Besides, no pressure has been brought to bear on us...."

"My relatives live in Gorkiy," said one of those present. "This is why I am concerned with the degree to which design solutions guarantee the safety of the station. Secondly, will the water in the Volga become contaminated as a result of its operation?"

"The operation of any nuclear power station involves a degree of risk," responded Ye. Yaremi. "However, given the approach which is contained in the design it is difficult to conceive of a possibility of a serious accident. I am convinced that the nuclear heating plants are safe. I live in Toronto, where such a station is situated in the immediate vicinity of the city. It does not occur to me to fear an accident there."

"In its concept and characteristics, the Gorkiy AST approximates nuclear stations built in the West," added Dr K. Gotzman from the FRG. "This indicates that the engineering thought is working in the same direction—toward improving the safety of stations."

With regard to the possible contamination of the Volga, the Turkish expert A. Gerpinar noted that the hot water is isolated from the reactor. For this reason, contamination of the river is ruled out. However, even if the possibility of an accident is assumed, in this case as well the release of radiation will be blocked instantly.

"What if an accident occurs due to 'external sources?'"

"The station will withstand a direct hit by a falling plane," reassured Ye. Yaremi. "Besides, its design is capable of [withstanding] the impact of a shock wave of up to 0.5 kilogram per square centimeter."

The British expert C. Hall, taking part in this "round-table" of sorts, noted that emergency protection systems would kick in in the event of an eventual reactor malfunction. In evaluating the psychological regimen of work by an operator at a nuclear power station as compared to driving a car, riding a bicycle, or walking in the woods, Ye. Yaremi opted for...a walk in the woods.

Soviet specialists also took part in the meeting with the public. In particular, responding to the question on the prospects for AST construction, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Gosatomenergonadzor [State Committee for Safety in the Atomic Power Industry] V. Sidorenko stated that similar stations will be built in the vicinity of Voronezh and Arkhangelsk. Science director of the project I. Sokolov added that building them is also planned in Bryansk, Ivanovo, and some other cities.

"In Arkhangelsk, they are protesting against this," came the immediate retort. "Is it correct for the population to take part in resolving the issue of whether to build a station?"

"It is exactly the population that has to make a decision," answered V. Sidorenko. "However, to this end it should also have objective information about the consequences of using alternative energy sources...."

The results of the first stage of the international expert review have reduced to a degree the doubts regarding the safety of design of the Gorkiy AST. In August, one more group of IAEA experts will conduct a 3-week examination in Gorkiy aimed at establishing the conformity of implementation to design solutions, and will check out all elements of the station. Based on the check, a final "diagnosis" of the safety of the Gorkiy Nuclear Heating Plant will be made.

Zaykov, Scientists Discuss Nuclear Safety

LD2806113489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1032 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—With the aim of working out specific decisions connected with insuring nuclear safety and the reliable operation of equipment at potentially dangerous installations—nuclear research reactors located within Moscow's boundaries—Lev Zaykov, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow city party committee, examined these problems at the I.V. Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute and the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, in conjunction with the country's leading specialists in the sphere of nuclear physics.

In the course of the discussions at the engineering physics institute, particular attention was paid to the technical state and realiability of a reactor used for teaching purposes and for the conduct of scientific research work. The institute's rector A.V. Shalnov [name as received] and the scientists engaged in using the reactor stressed that the reactor's safe operation is completely guaranteed.

Problems of insuring radiation safety in the capital also were discussed at the I.V. Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute. The institute's director, Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, spoke about the steps being taken by the institute's scientists to increase the reliability of the research reactors operating on its territory.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary underlined the importance of wide-ranging participation by the institute's scientists in the development and implementation of a city-wide ecological program, including problems of radiation safety.

The topical nature of creating a unified system for monitoring the ecological situation in the city, involving leading scientists and scientific research organizations of all ministries and departments, as well as the city's public, was emphasized.

Sociologist on Implications of Restructuring

AU2506154089 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 24 Jun 89 p 12

["Text" of an essay titled "Can Anybody Help Us?" by Soviet Sociologist Simon Kordonskiy in the April issue of the monthly XX CENTURY AND PEACE, published by the Soviet peace committee: "If the State's Wings Become Increasingly Limp...."]

[Text] Perestroyka represents a respite in the almost uninterrupted 70-year stream of radical restructuring of ordinary human relations. The state has made a stop and has looked around: What is broken? What has been built? The economy is broken—the links between hundreds of thousands of enterprises are only maintained through administrative measures. The social structures are broken—the people in the socialist society are connected through criminal laws and direct material dependencies and bottlenecks. Nature appears to have been ruined—big chemical enterprises, kolkhozes [collective farms], and sovkhozes [state farms] have contaminated the soil, hydroelectric power plants have dried up rivers, wood cutters from prison camps have cleared all the woodland, and thermo- and nuclear power plants have polluted the air. And what has been built?

Every citizen of this state has physically experienced it by seeing interruptions of the gas and electricity supply and many months of "preventive" repairs of the heating system, by smacking at the taste of the tap water, and by seeing the means of public transport which during rush hour resemble means for the evacuation of people from disaster areas or theaters of war.

Imagine if central heating electricity, gas, and the telephone in your house were cut off, if there were no water and the garbage were not disposed of—and all this in winter. At minus 15 degrees Centigrade, such a block of apartments, in which every other Soviet citizen lives, would freeze up in a few hours. Imagine that this happened not only in your house but in the city, in the business or administrative center, as it did in Bisk, Gorki, Severodvinsk, and recently Odessa. Then it turns out that the public services are not even able to localize disasters. For the elimination of the consequences, military units must be called in, and the people and industrial branches must be mobilized. In most places, the local infrastructure is totally outdated. Railroad and air traffic are overburdened and are not even able to handle the usual flow of goods. The gas pipelines have no gas desiccating installations and therefore freeze up; the energy system is based on the wrong principle of total centralization, and is automatically cut off if the electronic data processing system of the central dispatcher systems strike. The telecommunications system and all the other facilities of the Ministry of Posts certainly work worse than in war times. Let us take such an improbable overlapping of circumstances as in Chernobyl—the cold weather, traffic jams, accidents in the energy system, cutoffs of the heating system, and other things. Then the people are left alone and have to face the deadly infrastructure and nature which takes its due.

The farther away the year 1985—including the resolutions that were adopted during that time—becomes, the clearer becomes the past, and the more we fear the future. Having begun on a small scale, perestroyka has already changed a lot. The industrial and administrative centers are attacked by the ecological movement; republics, regions, and districts are becoming vehemently aware of their nationality; hundreds of informed groups grumble and want to state their dissatisfaction with the past and the present. The party and the state want to change, and they want to create something administratively new, but they only produce their own unimportant images. Thousands of cooperatives are trying in vain to sell their goods to foreign firms, if possible. The country is learning how to bargain—with itself.

The citizens of the world's first socialist state are sincerely convinced that you only need enough food, things, electronic toys, and so forth—and here we have that type of socialism that the state has been building for 70 years.

To help such citizens is difficult; in their hearts they are opposed to such help but would accept it in the form of modern technological products that are in short supply. They do not accept a different type of help, because it does not agree with their philosophy. The citizens of this state are opposed to foreign firms on Soviet territory—what are they doing here, are we unable to manage ourselves? They are opposed to joint ventures, and they are opposed to the participation of foreign capital in anything, because after all, everything Soviet guarantees quality.

Barely has the state relaxed control, when social institutions are set up which clearly work according to stereotypes that are typical of state-run institutions. For instance, the state has transferred to the cooperatives responsibility for the catering trade, services, and the production of a thousand small things. Very soon

shadow institutions emerged which have been legalized, and which purchase from the state means and materials, and organize the manufacture of poor-quality products. These institutions distribute them, in order to increase their income and their influence. Formerly, the state guaranteed to all social groups approximately the same access to services and goods, whereas the cooperatives do not care at all. Because of perestroyka, some social groups are without the daily necessities. Therefore, these groups' wish to put everything in its right place is quite natural and understandable.

Let us be honest: We have only small opportunities to prevent a catastrophe that may involve the entire globe. A possible opportunity would be direct help from the whole world for a state which was struck by an unprecedented disaster, namely its attempt to implement a great idea. It is really great—many millions of people sacrificed their lives for it. Never before did mankind have to pay more dearly for an idea, and no philosopher has answered the question of whether man should sacrifice his life for an idea.

There is a tragic harmony in the fact that Russia at one time expected and prepared a world revolution, so as to have an opportunity to build socialism with the help of the proletariat of the developed countries. Thank God, this revolution has not taken place, and now the USSR needs the help of the whole world to return to the fold of world history and world economy.

The world that is not affected by revolutionary restructuring is basically ready to help the country. However, is the country ready to accept help? What kind of help does it need? These are not trivial questions, because the country's political and economic structures are self-sufficient, and because—as experience has shown—help in the form of goods and capital only deepens the internal tensions and conflicts. What is more, even the idea of help sometimes causes covert or overt opposition; people just do not like to think about it, as long as there is no rumble of thunder. However, once the thunder rumbles, it is too late—and by no means because there is no help. One can help a real existing entity, just as the allies helped in the last war. A military dictatorship as well as a fragmentation of the country into independent states would entail disruption, disintegration of social ties, epidemics, and the blocking of the telecommunications and transport systems. Help will then be focused on saving individuals, but it will not be focused on the existence of a state, no matter what type of state. That is no help; it is an alms, comparable to the work of the American Relief Administration following the civil war.

The only method to break through the magic circle is to incorporate the country in the economic and political international community. Qualifications, skills, theoretical frameworks, and specific institutions that develop in an open economy—only on this basis can we overcome the stereotypes of life, for which there is now no way out. Direct financial and material aid, meaning credits and goods supplies, are not only useless, they even work against perestroyka. They have disappeared and will disappear without leaving a trace through channels of the shadow economy and public distribution, and they will only deepen the bottlenecks and touch off conflicts between the social groups of the existing society. Without a change in the main production conditions and other social conditions, such material aid becomes some non-installed equipment, hidden workbenches and chemicals, and is spent on more official trips abroad of socialist trade officials.

Obviously, aid must consist in underpinning the strategy and tactic of denationalization. As I said earlier, the state has everything but is unable to cope with everything. It is basically ready to give away part of what it has, which has been demonstrated by agricultural policy and the forcible introduction of the lease system and other forms of ownership. The state's endeavors to share ownership do not meet with enthusiasm. It turns out that nobody wants ownership, and that nobody wants to assume responsibility for his own existence now. People do not need to be owners; they feel quite comfortable at the state's hearth. Under the state's wings, Soviet citizens look confidently to the future; that these wings are becoming increasingly limp, does not worry them very much. They believe that they will hold up during their lifetime.

Help is necessary to force people to take the rights and at the same time accept the economic and political duties. In order to survive, the country needs real economists and sociologists, organizers of production, financial experts, and skilled workers. Money is needed to pay foreign specialists for theoretically cementing the changes, and to pay them at least for the first steps of their implementation. Much is happening now. Joint ventures and schools for the training of skilled workers and managers are being set up. However, the basis is too small.

The state must modify the concept of perestroyka: Perestroyka must bring about a change from the simple redistribution of the state's sphere of influence and the influence of the institutes of the shadow economy, policy, and ideology, that are coordinated with the state—a change in relations between man on the one hand, and society, on the other. Every citizen must become a juristic person who is fully responsible for himself. The Soviet citizen must simply become an individual who lives his life, no matter what life it may be.

Roy Medvedev Criticizes PRAVDA on Gdlyan-Ivanov

PM2106145189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[Roy A. Medvedev letter "To PRAVDA Editorial Board"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The press has already announced that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies formed a commission to check materials linked with the activity of the USSR

Prosecutor's Office investigation group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan. The commission comprises 16 USSR people's deputies. R.A. Medvedev has been elected chairman of the commission and people's deputies E.V. Bichkauskas and Yu.V. Golik his deputies.

Our commission did not and could not aim to restrict citizens' right to hold legally authorized rallies and demonstrations. Nor did we call for the numerous committees for the "defense of Gdlyan and Ivanov," which were set up previously in Leningrad, Moscow, and other cities, to be disbanded. We requested that copies of the materials these committees and groups had in their possession be put at our disposal. We also appealed to individual citizens and groups to abandon pressure on and threats against our commission as a whole and against its individual members. Our commission's most insistent request was, however, directed toward the mass media—that they refrain during the commission's work from any debate on this case.

Unfortunately, PRAVDA turned out to be a newspaper that failed to consider our request. In edition No 170 of 19 June the newspaper carried an article entitled "The Commission Will Bring the Matter to a Close," an extremely strange title.

I must say right away that our commission has no intention of rushing its work and conclusions; this was the main shortcoming of previous commissions dealing with the same "case." Nor do we have the intention or any right to "bring the matter to a close." The commission's task is to examine both all the complaints from the USSR Prosecutor's Office regarding the activity of the investigation group set up by the USSR Prosecutor's Office itself, and all comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov's accusations and complaints against the USSR Prosecutor's Office and other organizations and individuals. It is only after this that the commission should report on its findings to the next Congress of People's Deputies, which alone will be able to "draw this matter to a close."

We have still not as yet received any documents and materials and have been unable to either study or analyze them. It is only over the next few days that we have been promised that the premises for commissions will be fully equipped and we will be given safes to store documents and recording equipment. At present we are only elaborating the plan and strategy for the commission's work, which promises to be, as I said above, quite a long process.

I do not know what Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov said at the rallies, "in anticipation of the commission's conclusions," as PRAVDA writes. However, neither Gdlyan nor Ivanov have as yet expressed any disrespect for the people's deputies who comprise the commission and we intended, with their full agreement, to hear out their statements at the 27 June sitting and obtain written material from them containing complaints against various people and organizations. Although the PRAVDA editorial board also stresses that its article "did not aim to exert the slightest influence on the results of the commission's work," however, the first reaction from all commission members to the PRAVDA article was extremely negative and many regard it precisely as an attempt to exert pressure on the commission. We can see from the numerous cables and statements we have received that the PRAVDA article can only substantially complicate the commission's work and that it is such articles, much more than any statements by Gdlyan and Ivanov, which will, to use the newspaper's words, "excite public opinion and create an unhealthy hullabaloo over the work of the commission of deputies and impede the establishment of the truth."

Donetsk Racketeers Get 'Severest Posible' Sentences

PM2706102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent N. Lisovenko dispatch under the rubric "Courtroom Reports": "End of a Gang of Racketeers"]

[Text] Donetsk—Back in April this year IZVESTIYA (issue No 99) reported the opening of the trial of a group of racketeers. The trial has now ended, and, as already reported on television, the criminals have been sentenced.

It took 2 days in the Donetsk Oblast Court to read out the sentences in the case of 11 racketeers who had committed a series of serious crimes. The gang was led by V. Konovalov, former militia senior lieutenant on the criminal investigations staff of Donetsk's Kiyevskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. His most intimate associates were V. Beletskiy, university graduate, past member of the CPSU, and chief of Kiyevskiy Rayon Workers Supplies Store; V. Borkhalenko, a mining technician by training and candidate master of sports, who distinguished himself by exceptional cruelty; G. Kravchenko, fitter at the Donetsk refrigeration combine; Ye. Ponomarenko, fitter at the "Stroymekhanizatsiya" Trust; V. Chernykh, driver with the oblast Movie Theaters Network Department; A. Voronov, driver with the oblast's "Khlebprom" Association; I. Turzayev, glass containers reception clerk; and A. Filippenko, V. Lipkov, and V. Grebechenko, who are unemployed and have been tried and sentenced in the past.

The hearing of the racketeers' case lasted almost 3 months. It was fully established that they are guilty of the premeditated murder of Anatoliy Samoylenko, former military airman who became chairman of one of Donetsk's first cooperatives, and of torturing physician Aleksandra Astapova, who was tortured with a red-hot soldering iron by the criminals, who were demanding a nonexistent sum of R60,000 as ransom. They also murdered Mariupol barman Vladimir Pochkov and stole R10,000, which he had saved to buy a car.

Konovalov's raiders also tried to rob Pavel Belovolov, chief of the Makeyevka metallurgical combine fruit base, using tear gas in the process. Only good fortune saved him from death or mutilation.

The group of gangsters operated with impunity for over 2 years, largely due to its being led by turncoat V. Konovalov who, being a specialist, imaginatively planned the crimes and anticipated possible actions by militia staffers to solve them.

The gangleader's certainty of impunity was boundless. It was proved that, when a composite picture of Anatoliy Samoylenko's murderers had been composed from eyewitness descriptions, and copies were distributed to V. Konovalov and other militia staffers, he looked at his own image and indignantly exclaimed:

"Look here, you guys, the criminal looks just like me!"

Nonetheless, the oblast soviet executive committee's internal affairs organs exposed the shrewd criminal and his accomplices.

Chief State Prosecuting Attorney Galina Yemelina demanded the severest possible punishment for the criminals. And the court meted it out. V. Konovalov and V. Beletskiy were sentenced to the exceptional measure of punishment—execution by firing squad, while the rest were given long terms of imprisonment in strict-regime colonies.

Holy Synod Panel Examines Repressions

LD2106100789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Holy Synod Commission at Work"]

[Text] The first session of the Holy Synod commission set up to study materials concerning the rehabilitation of groundlessly repressed representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church clergy and laity has been held in Moscow. The session took place at the Moscow Patriarchate with Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk in the chair.

In a conversation with a TASS correspondent Metropolitan Vladimir said that the commission's members discussed the tasks facing it and exchanged opinions on the information already received by the commission from 29 dioceses.

We arrived at the opinion, the metropolitan said, that people subjected to repressions in the past because of their beliefs do not need rehabilitation from the religious-moral point of view. They deserve the church's reverence. As regards their civil rehabilitation, this is primarily a task of the state and society as a whole, since they have now set themselves the goal of restoring justice. The church is prepared to cooperate in the accomplishment of this noble goal by our society.

Metropolitan Vladimir announced that the commission's first session examined letters and applications regarding the rehabilitation of specific individuals, the identification of their burial places, and the provision of material assistance to the victims' relatives. The commission addressed diocesan bishops with a request to continue gathering information with a view to perpetuating the memory of innocent victims.

The good name of clerics and believers has already been restored, the metropolitan said. First and foremost among them I would like to mention Priest Pavel Florenskiy, who is known not only as a man of the church but also as a major scientist and public figure. We are happy to participate in the process of renewal and of building a rule-of-law state and society which is now under way in our state, he added.

RSFSR Writers View Ethnic Relations

PM2606112189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by Major B. Kazakov: "We Have One Russia for All: Notes from Out of Town Sitting of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Writers Union Secretariat"]

[Text] However bitter it is to realize, today reports of perturbing events on the soil of interethnic relations no longer make us wonder: How could something like that happen in our country? In many cities meetings are in full swing at which the speakers are shouting slogans which grate upon the ears of any sensible person in an attempt to explain the social and daily disorders by the "machinations" of another people who have lived nearby for centuries.

Society is worried by this state of affairs. The theme of interethnic relations was a dominant one at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and it is being discussed in literally every family, and in every labor and military collective. Naturally, the writers of multinational Russia cannot bypass it either—which is why the latest sitting of the secretariat of the board of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Writers Union was devoted to precisely this problem and why it took place in the capital of Adyge Autonomous Oblast—Maykop.

"In Russia there are two symbols of the unity of our peoples, of the commonality of our problems and interests—they are the Volga and the Caucasus," S. Mikhalkov, chairman of the board of the Russian Writers Union, said as he opened the first sitting. "I shall not conceal the fact that many of my comrades were against this out of town secretariat and suggested waiting a while until the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on interethnic relations takes place. But time does not wait, and we decided to work."

It is hard not to agree with that. Time, if you do not notice its rapid passage, works against us. And Fergana and Novyy Uzen have already been added to the events

in Nagorno-Karabakh, Baku, Yerevan, and Tbilisi... The people are angrily denouncing the senseless acts of bloodshed and have grown tired of shrill slogans calculated for "self expression" and of pointless strikes. The people demand an opportunity to work calmly without being afraid for their children's lives and souls.

It is probably not worth mentioning how important under these conditions is the writer's word, checked by the truth, balanced by reason, calling people away from enmity and toward understanding and a search for constructive decisions. There is no denying that this year there are also people who, seemingly tired of literary glory, are setting themselves up as the messiah without thinking about where irresponsible words and appeals can lead people, particularly young people. Speculating on the lack of experience of young souls has always been considered a crime. Our recent history also knows of such speculation—you only have to remember Trotskiy, whom people today are almost trying to promote to the rank of a virtual precursor of restructuring and who tried to play the same "youth card" in the struggle for influence in the party. It is a bad thing that the lessons of history are forgotten so rapidly and that seething squares are filled with young men excited to the point of savagery.

"Recently," N. Shundik, secretary of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union, noted in his report, "there has been a fashion to deny our entire history as consisting of nothing but crimes and errors. Is that sensible? In the words of Mustam Karim, 'the result is that we are a country of inferior people... That we can make a pygmy out of a giant.' They want to make their fathers and grandfathers look like pygmies in the eyes of the young people. That is a terrible absurdity, a most flagrant lie, which deeply offends the generation of frontline soldiers and all our peoples.

There is no task more important today than preserving unity in our common home, than safeguarding and developing national traditions, native language and culture. Fiction and profound, passionate journalism can and must help society to halt extremism, to prevent national feuds from spreading throughout the country. Yet a tendency toward this can, alas, be observed.

For a long time we artificially held back and kept quiet about these processes. But today they require fundamental solutions. In the era of glasnost and restructuring the nationalities question has produced a kind of "released spring effect."

The spring has worked. And if a bureaucrat tries to pretend as he did before that this has not happened, then the adventurists use events for their own purposes. In an interview with Radio "Liberty" a woman critic of ours went so far as to speak of an imminent civil war in the USSR. This idea, presented to please Glezer, editor of the almanac STRELETS, was taken up not only by various voices and the "samizdat" but also by other publications of ours of which O. Suleymenov rightly said at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies: They are rowing so strongly to the left that the boat is turning sharply to the right. And the picture you get is: crimes and stagnation behind us and civil war ahead of us. And it is only today's pain, only what must be done right now to correct yesterday's mistakes and to prevent gloom tomorrow, which does not interest these "prophets." Their hearts do not bleed.

But how can our hearts fail to bleed when A. Nemtushkin, a leader of the Krasnoyarsk writers' organization, cites the following figures: The average life expectancy for northerners is 41-42 and the Tungus and the Evenk, who numbered 70,000 in 1896, numbered only 27,500 in 1979 while there are just a few hundred of some other ethnic groups!

And here is what R. Mukhamadiyev, chairman of the Tatar Writers Union board, said:

"Omniscient statisticians assert that in our country, which we used to regard as the country which read the most in the world, every fourth young person does not read fiction at all, that young people almost never go to the theater and that, while it is true that they like the cinema, it is only on condition that it shows ways of killing people or erotic scenes. In urban families grandmothers and grandchildren often literally speak different languages.

Listening to the speakers, I involuntarily caught myself thinking that these grandchildren, as they grow up, will join the military collective without any concept of their own national culture in their hearts. Sometimes you are amazed when you talk with a young soldier who speaks of the encroachment on his national dignity: After all, he does not know his people's traditions or heroes but he already knows how to conceal his elementary maladjustment to life under what is virtually a political mask. So often a young soldier's course has had to begin with the "liquidation of illiteracy." And you have to read the great works of Abay, for instance, in Russian: It turns out that the young man has not managed to read him in the original at home.

The participants in the sitting of the RSFSR Writers Union secretariat were not calling for national limitation but for the restoration of Lenin's principles of internationalism, for the removal of unjustified restrictions on the publication of books and journals in national languages both in the autonomous republics and oblasts and beyond.

"In the most difficult years," P. Afanasyev, leader of the Chuvash Writers Union, said, "there were dozens of publications in our native language and national theaters operated beyond the confines of the autonomous republic in places with a dense population of Chuvash—in Kazan, Ufa, and Moscow, and other parts of the country. Today there is none of that."

This artificial estrangement from the native home and native language is the source of many troubles: the lack of spirituality, the frivolity with which lovers of "democracy meetings" make fools of young people, pushing them toward pogroms and riots and often presenting Moscow, the Russian people, and the Russian language in the image of the enemy of national culture. This is also the lot of the armed forces as God himself has decreed, as they say: After all Russian is used in the army and navy. How can they fail here to throw in the idea of national formations with special privileges for the indigenous inhabitants!

But the speeches at the secretariat were not only pervaded with pain for their own national, vital concerns. A great deal was also said about how the Russian language and Russian culture has been overtaken by the tragedy common to all peoples.

In particular, the poet Ye. Isayev cited the following example:

"Take Northwest Russia: Novgorod, Pskov, Smolensk, Bryansk. Look how many oblasts there are and what cities there are! And there is not a single literary journal, not a single publishing house. Or take Krasnodar Kray, where only the small almanac KUBAN is published, yet it should be a full-blooded journal! But the writers' desire alone is too little for that...."

"All of us here are inhabitants of Russia," K. Shazzo, a writer from Adyge Autonomous Oblast continued this subject. "And I am no less concerned than others that the great Russian culture is being destroyed—deliberately and perfidiously. And the blame for that rests not with the Chuvash, the Osetians, or the Adyge—bureaucrats stand above national affiliation, those bureaucrats who are to blame for this and many of whom hold responsible posts to this day. And this pains not only the Russians but also inhabitants of Russia like us, because we have one Russia for all."

There is no doubt that the work of the secretariat was greatly influenced by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in Moscow. Many of the speeches of the people's elected representatives had something in common with the writers' words. And it is gratifying that these words were considered and rational. Even when talk turned to a question as delicate and painful as the debates which arose between the Ingush and the Osetians, there prevailed prudence, comradely understanding, and resistance to all kinds of hasty conclusions, decisions, and actions.

The speeches delivered at the secretariat and to the working people of Adyge Autonomous Oblast by the Muscovite poet A. Parpara, the Bashkir writer G. Khasimov, Moscow literary critic A. Vlasenko, writers M. Kilchichakov from Khakass Autonomous Oblast, B. Bedyurov from Gorno-Altay Autonomous Oblast, Muscovite V. Dolyanikov, and many others were interesting and substantive.

...A week passed imperceptibly. And now we were flying out of Krasnodar. The city scorched by the steppe sun is gasping from the exhaust fumes and the sticky moisture of the artificial seas which have changed not only the region's climate, ecology, and economy but also, specialists assert, the social structure and mentality of the indigenous inhabitants. The secretariat also paid considerable attention to social and ecological problems. Summing up the results of its work S. Mikhalkov said very aptly:

"The problem of interethnic relations includes two basic components: ecology and language. Disregarding language means destroying literature and in fact all culture; disregarding the ecology means destroying man himself. I think our common voice will be heard not only by the country's writers but also by all those who hold dear our fraternal literature and the friendship and unity of the motherland."

Authorial Rights of Solzhenitsyn Violated

18001266 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 89 p 4

[Article by V. Borisov under "Letters to the Editor": "About the Publication of the Works of A. Solzhenitsyn"]

[Text] Dear comrade editor!

A number of our publishing houses, journals, and newspapers have been displaying a special interest recently in the works of A.I. Solzhenitsyn who has been in exile since 1974.

Some journals and publishing houses have submitted offers to the writer about the publication of one or another of his works. Other publishing organs considered it unnecessary for them to observe the elementary norms of literary ethics. In its June issues, the journal OGONYOK published A. Solzhenitsyn's story "Matrenin Dvor," without notifying the author or getting his permission, and it provided a "preface" by B. Sarnov, and also illustrations. This is a gross infringement of author's rights that are now in effect. (Article 480 of the Civil Code of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] states: "It is also forbidden, without the approval of the author, to provide illustrations, prefaces, epilogues, commentaries, and any kind of explanations in its publication.")

The weekly LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA recently reported on the publication of a collection of prose by A. Solzhenitsyn in the "Sovetskaya Rossiya" publishing house (the collection was compiled by critic Vl. Bondarenko). However, it is known that neither the compiler

nor the publisher obtained the concurrence of the author for this publication. One asks: How is it possible to compile and publish the works of a now living author without his concurrence?

To avoid such incidents in the future, I ask that the following be brought to everyne's attention:

A.I. Solzhenitsyn has granted all rights for the use of his publications in the territory of the USSR to NOVYY MIR, with whom he has had literary ties for many years in the person of S.P. Zalygin, his chief editor, and V.M. Borisov, deputy supervisor of the prose section. Without the permission of these persons, or of the author himself, the works of A.I. Solzhenitsyn in any form, including theatrical productions, and television and movie scripting, is not permissible.

New Film 'The Slave' Reflects Reality

18001242 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 24, 17-23 Jun 89 p 6

[Commentary by film director Vadim Abdrashitov: "A Requiem for Slaves"; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] **The premier of the the new feature film "The Slave" took place in the capital's movie theaters. This picture will soon appear on the screens of other cities as well. The name of its director, Vadim Abdrashitov, is probably known to those interested in the cinema: "The Train Stopped," "Fox Hunt," "The Parade of Planets," "Plumbum, or The Dangerous Game": These and other pictures filmed on the screenplays of his constant co-author, Aleksandr Mindadze, are distinguished by a social sensitivity, a vigilance, and at the same time, the ability to "focus" on the perception of essential, profound, and "eternal" things.**

At the recent 34th International Film Festival in West Berlin, "The Slave" received two special awards: the prize of the festival's founder, Alfred (Bauer), the "film opening new prospects in the development of cinematography," and the prize of the international evangelists' center "For dialectic exposition of the problem of crime and punishment." The evangelists' center is planning to conduct a special symposium devoted to the film "The Slave" this autumn.

Of course, the audience will judge it. But the director himself, V. Abdrashitov, presents his new work today.

Viewers usually ask, how did the idea arise for this or that film, in what interrelationships with reality, with actuality? The basis for the appearance of "The Slave" was an article in a central newspaper on the career of a important and corrupt bureaucrat, and the legal investigation related to his career; there was a line in the article about how this bureaucrat's chauffeur had become his slave, his orderly in various matters and details. We found the history of the slave interesting.

In addition, to speak of the second character in the film, of Gudionov, the bureaucrat himself, here we were interested in the embodiment of a category of devil, existing outside of time and space, in all times, "materializing" today in the form of a major bureaucrat. At the same time, Gudionov, marvelously portrayed in the film by Oleg Borisov, is a complex creature, a sort of "white demon." He is a "good" master, smart, witty, in general, advantageously differentiated from the canonical type of bureaucrat. I even have sympathy for him: His personality is without a doubt, unrealized, and he is also a Slave. A slave of the "Idea," of the struggle for power, and at times, he is even more of a slave than his chauffeur...

One of our viewers said that the picture could have been called "If..." What would happen if we were ruled not by "black" but by "white" demons, such as Gudionov? If there had been such "nice" feudalists? What would have changed? Nothing, and this is what our film is about. Nothing, because all the same, behind these people is collapse, rot and destruction. Absolute power of one man over another is the guarantee of collapse and destruction, since this absolute is immoral.

But we do not pass sentence on our heroes. My sympathy is extended to Klyuyev, Gudionov's chauffeur, as well (I feel that actor Yu. Belyayev played this role excellently). Yes, the slave is an underling, toady "jackal," as he is called in the film, but he is also molded by time! He is also a victim, a man who has essentially lived an alien life, "made" by the hands of the Master.

It may seem to someone that in "The Slave" there is a certain theme of irrationalism, that this is not a completely realistic picture. I do not think that this is the case. It has very strong ties to our actuality; the reality of life in it is in no way deformed. Yes, the picture has a fairly conditional plot, a generic method of character resolution, but the reality in it is absolutely Soviet, and the people as well. It is another question if our reality is sometimes so absurd and irrational, so super-expressive that some of its signs, the details fixed in film may seem irrational.

Our film is not a bare publicistic work, not an unmasking, not the embodiment of a way of life such as slavery. More likely, this is a requiem, a lament for (many!) entire generations who had fallen into the meat grinder of time, drawn into dirty political games; a lament for the people whose lives became the material for such games, for this meat grinder.

Military

Continued Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident

No Radiation Found at Accident Site

LD2806223789 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Oslo June 28 TASS—Experts from the Norwegian Institute of Radiation Hygiene have found no trace of

radiation leakage from a Soviet nuclear submarine which had an accident in the Barents Sea last Monday, an Institute spokesman told reporters.

The experts, who studied air and water samples taken in the accident area, said that radioactive radiation at the site of the submarine's surfacing and along the path passed by it does not exceed the level normal for this area.

They thoroughly studied six water samples, taken in various places of the submarine's location, and an air filter from a Norwegian coast guard vessel.

Precision instruments revealed no deviation from the norm in any case.

Sub To Be Checked for Radiation

LD2806222989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Interview with Vladimir Trofimovich Kudymov, Naval squadron chief chemist, and two other unidentified persons, by own correspondent Valeriy Anuchin; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] As has already been reported, a breakdown occurred on the main power unit of an atomic submarine of the Northern Fleet in an area 350 km south of Medvezhiy Island on 26 June. On 28 June the submarine arrived in base after completing the crossing. Here is a report from our correspondent Valeriy Anuchin.

[Begin recording] [Anuchin] The submarine was expected only by 29 June, but it has arrived today. For part of the voyage from Medvezhiy Island where the accident occurred the submarine travelled on its own power, using its diesel units. Ships of the Northern fleet which arrived promptly took it in tow, and brought it to base. The submarine is now being moored at her berth. A radiation check will be carried out.

And now a brief interview with Vladimir Trofimovich Kudymov, the naval squadron's chief chemist. Vladimir Trofimovich, you have just checked the submarine. What is the position?

[Kudymov] As far as the radiation situation on the submarine is concerned, you can judge for yourself by our sailors—you can see they are all happy and very cheerful. That indicates that the radiation situation on the submarine has not affected people's health.

[Anuchin] [speaking to unidentified man] This occurred near Medvezhiy Island. How did it happen and how did the crew conduct itself? What measures did you take straight away?

[Unidentified man] A defect appeared on the MPU [main power unit], a decision was taken....

[Anuchin] A defect on...?

[Unidentified man] A defect on the Main Power Unit, the MPU. I made the decision to take it out of operation. During cooling, to improve the cooling conditions, I lowered the protection mechanism on the second on-board reactor as well. I switched to auxiliary means of propulsion fuel sources.

[Anuchin] The radiation situation must have been difficult at this time?

[Unidentified man] No, the radiation situation during the lowering of the protection mechanism—and the lowering of the protection mechanism on the other reactor too—was normal. It is altogether normal now as well.

[Second unidentified man] The lads acted on orders from the commander resolutely. They skillfully eliminated the malfunctions, and ensured the safety of the whole crew. [end recording]

Collision With Bird Cause of MiG Airshow Crash

LD2906075989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 29 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jun (TASS)—A collision with a bird was the cause of the MiG-29 crash which took place on 8 June, on the day Le Bourget international aerospace show opened. This is the conclusion of the competent Soviet-French commission which investigated the disaster. The sides signed the verdict on its causes 27 June in Moscow. This is reported in today's SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA.

At first, the media suggested that a stone had entered the turbine of the Soviet fighter. This idea somehow cast suspicion on the show organizers implying that the runway had not been cleaned properly.

"Having found the exact causes of the accident the commission removed suspicions from the French side, Dmitriy Ogorodnikov, head of the Central Institute for Aviation Engine Building and chairman of the commission on the Soviet side, said in conversation with the newspaper's correspondent. This was noted with satisfaction by General Rougevin-Boville, who signed the investigation report. Our technology has been 'rehabilitated,' too; alas, certain people hinted at its unrealiability. A sensible question arises, however: Could the aircraft have been saved? The MiG has two engines, and the right one failed. In such situations the faulty engine should be shut off and the flight should continue on the good engine. If the fighter had been at a higher altitude, everything would have been all right. But an altitude of 160 meters is not enough. The pilot ejected at an even lower altitude of 92 meters."